

QUARTALSCHRIFT (Theological Quarterly)

Edited by

The Faculty of the Lutheran Theological Seminary
Thiensville, Wisconsin

Paul Peters, Ph. D., Managing Editor, P. O. Box 952.

Volume 46 Contents for January, 1949 Number 1

Opening Sermon At Seventy-Fifth Anniversary Convention Of The Synodical Conference Of North America. Norman A. Madson	1
Ancient Heresies In Modern Garb. E. Reim	11
Religious Liberty In An Economic Society. Eugene Wengert	27
The Masoretic Text And The Text OF The Newly Discovered Isaiah Manuscript. P. Peters	49
News And Comments	60
Reviewers' Desk	77

Theological Quarterly (Quartalschrift) is published by the Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, 8, Wis., in the interest of the Ev. Luth. Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States. Subscription price \$1.50 per year payable in advance. Entered as Second Class Matter May 14, 1904, under Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at the special rate of postage, as provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized August 26, 1918.

QUARTALSCHRIFT (Theological Quarterly)

Edited by

The Faculty of the Lutheran Theological Seminary
Thiensville, Wisconsin

Paul Peters, Ph. D., Managing Editor, P. O. Box 952.

Volume 46 Contents for April, 1949 Number 2

Letters Addressed To Lutheran Pastors, Concerning The Status Of The Lutheran Churches In The World. Herm. Sasse....	81
Ancient Heresies In Modern Garb. E. Reim.....	95
Luther Praised By Catholics. Wm. Dallmann.....	108
News And Comments.....	129
News Without Comment.....	142
Reviewers' Desk.....	148

Theological Quarterly (Quartalschrift) is published by the Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, 8, Wis., in the interest of the Ev. Luth. Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States. Subscription price \$1.50 per year payable in advance. Entered as Second Class Matter May 14, 1904, under Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at the special rate of postage, as provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized August 26, 1918.

QUARTALSCHRIFT (Theological Quarterly)

Edited by

The Faculty of the Lutheran Theological Seminary
Thiensville, Wisconsin

Paul Peters, Ph. D., Managing Editor, P. O. Box 952.

Volume 46	Contents for July, 1949	Number 3
Closing Address. M.....		161
Letters Addressed To Lutheran Pastors, Concerning The Nature Of Confession In The Church. Herm. Sasse.....		168
Prayer Fellowship. M.....		184
Luther Praised By Catholics. Wm. Dallmann.....		195
News And Comments.....		207
Reviewers' Desk.....		221

Theological Quarterly (Quartalschrift) is published by the Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, 8, Wis., in the interest of the Ev. Luth. Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States. Subscription price \$1.50 per year payable in advance. Entered as Second Class Matter May 14, 1904, under Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at the special rate of postage, as provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized August 26, 1918.

QUARTALSCHRIFT (Theological Quarterly)

Edited by

The Faculty of the Lutheran Theological Seminary

Thiensville, Wisconsin

Paul Peters, Ph. D., Managing Editor, P. O. Box 952.

Volume 46	Contents for October, 1949	Number 4
<hr/>		
Letters Addressed To Lutheran Pastors, Concerning The Nature Of Confession In The Church. Herm. Sasse.....		225
Prayer Fellowship. M.		244
The "New Approach" In "Lutheran" Teaching.....		259
Zum rechten Verstaendnis des 4. Artikels der Confessio Augustana. Friedrich Wilhelm Hopf.....		264
Luther Praised By Catholics. Wm. Dallmann.....		274
News And Comment.....		281
News Without Comment.....		298
Reviewers' Desk		301

Theological Quarterly (Quartalschrift) is published by the Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, 8, Wis., in the interest of the Ev. Luth. Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States. Subscription price \$1.50 per year payable in advance. Entered as Second Class Matter May 14, 1904, under Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at the special rate of postage, as provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized August 26, 1918.

Quartalschrift

Theological Quarterly

Number 1

January, 1949

Volume 46

OPENING SERMON AT SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY CONVENTION OF THE SYNODICAL CONFERENCE OF NORTH AMERICA

TRINITY LUTHERAN CHURCH, MILWAUKEE, WIS.
AUGUST 3, 1948, 10:00 A. M.

Prayer

Thou God of all mercy and truth, who hast taught us: "All the paths of the Lord *are* mercy and truth unto such as keep his covenant and his testimonies," we thank Thee because Thou didst give our sainted fathers "one heart and one way, for the good of them, and of their children after them." But since there be siren voices calling us from the beaten paths of Thine everlasting covenant, grant us grace by Thy Spirit to seek none other way than that concerning which Thou hast said: "The path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." Hear our prayer, and to that end bless the preaching of Thy word of eternal truth also in this hour. We ask it in Christ's Savior name. Amen.

Jeremiah 6, 16

"Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls."

Fellow redeemed, grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

Though it be not the same text with which the beloved Walther greeted our sainted fathers when our Synodical Conference first convened in this very city three-score and sixteen years ago, we have no other aim nor holier desire than had that fearless

confessor of the faith, when he in his *ex corde* prayer pleaded with the Father: "Forsake us not, but grant us now and evermore, as oft as we foregather, Thy gracious presence, and sustain us, for without Thee we can do nothing but err, sin, and destroy Thy work."

Well *might* we have chosen the selfsame text: "Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee," 1 Tim. 4, 16, stressing, as did he, the fact that "the holy apostle does not say: 'Take heed unto the *chief* doctrines,' but: 'Take heed unto the *doctrine*,' — *everything* which is taught in God's word." But while the text be different, the tenor of our anniversary address will be the same. In fact, were we not to stress the absolute need of purity of doctrine, *all doctrines*, and the unequivocal acceptance of the same within our brotherhood, our very existence as a Synodical Conference would no longer be justified. For our founding fathers made that clear, from the very day of its inception, that the Conference desired to retain unsullied and inviolate as its highest good and most precious pearl, doctrine pure, as found in God's verbally inspired word and our treasured Confessions based thereon. And they pledged one another their sacred word of honor that they would fight shoulder to shoulder in contending for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints, be their enemy "Rationalism, Unionism, Indifferentism, or Sentimentalism." (We are quoting.)

This will involve us in stark realism, to be sure. But there is no higher realism than that of our Christian religion. It must ever be as frank as it is fearless. It has as little room for diplomatic double-talk as its Founder had patience with the hypocritical church leaders of His day. And we would most certainly violate a rule of all true Lutheran preaching, were we to address you as though nothing had happened during these three quarter centuries to disturb our sacred alliance.

We must as Lutheran Christians face facts, no matter how unpleasant the task may become. For God wants us to be honest with Him, with ourselves, as well as with our fellowmen. Wishful thinking and unsubstantiated claims are not going to solve our problem any more than will the delusion that salvation may

be had by believing a lie. It is as true today as it was on yon day when Paul first penned it: "We can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth." 2 Cor. 13, 8.

What then is our problem? In brief, it is this: Shall we continue in the paths our fathers trod, calling all manner of Unionism a sin which robs the inviolate word of its majesty and saving grace, leaving ultimately all who practice it in the Slough of Despond? Or shall ours be a new course? Have we erred in marking and avoiding those who are indifferent to the love of pure doctrine, and who have placed in its stead a would-be love of men which is as shallow as it is powerless to save? Are we guilty of "spiritual standpatism" when we refuse to go forward at men's behest, or is there such a thing as pleasing God by refusing to go up hence if God's gracious presence go not with us? Well, our text gives the answer. It is on the basis of this more sure word of prophecy and by the guidance of the Holy Spirit that we shall briefly discuss:

"The Crying Need of Our Beloved Conference"

1. *First of all, it needs to realize anew, in these days of rampant Unionism, that not all forward movement means progress.*

There are times when "they also serve who only stand and wait." And what is the occasion for their waiting? Isaiah answers: "But they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk and not faint." Isa. 40, 31. There is a man-made *busyness* which is as far removed from the youthful Nazarene's being about His Father's *business* as utter frustration is removed from Jehovah's quiet command: "Be still, and know that I am God." Ps. 46. 10.

Now, we can sympathize with those who are anxious to stave off the threats of a mighty Assyria by making alliances with that bruised reed Egypt, even as our hearts went out in commiseration for a Chamberlain at Munich. But the policy of appeasement with those who have, to begin with, broken faith with God is as futile as it is wicked. To lean upon such a bruised reed will be as sure to pierce the hand today as in the days of an Hezekiah.

There is a feverish anxiety among pseudo-Lutherans to join hands with all who bear the Lutheran name, regardless of what their attitude toward doctrine may be, which borders on ecclesiastical hysteria. In order to make an impact on a distraught and jittery world, an imposing "Lutheran World Federation" was set up in Lund, Sweden, last year which was to be the mightiest voice which had been heard since the days of a Martin Luther. But what was it which sounded forth from Anders Nygren's committee on doctrine at that Lund assembly? Quote: "The Gospel is so exceedingly rich that no one section of the Church can claim to have fully and exhaustively comprehended all its wealth. One church has grasped more of it, another less. One has penetrated to the heart of it, while another has remained more on the circumference. One has grasped one aspect and another another. In this respect the churches can learn from each other and help each other to reach a simpler, richer, and deeper understanding of the Gospel." Unquote.

At first blush that may seem to be a most humble confession. But let us analyze it. If no church can claim to have fully and exhaustively comprehended all of the Gospel, where does that leave Paul, who declares to the Ephesian elders that he had "not shunned to declare unto them all the counsel of God"? Acts 20, 27. It would leave him in the Ananias Club, would it not? And since the various churches are to render reciprocal help in arriving at a simpler, richer and deeper understanding of the Gospel, can you tell me how one who is still out in the periphery is going to help the person who already is at the heart and center of the Gospel to a deeper understanding of it? If no one can lay claim to having all of the Gospel, how then could a Paul pronounce his "ANATHEMA SIT" upon anyone who preached any other Gospel than that which he had preached unto the Galatians? Suppose that other person proclaimed that bit of the Gospel which Paul had failed to preach, since he could not possibly have all of it, should he then have as his reward for his labors: "Let him be accursed"? Gal. 1, 8.

But there is more to that doctrinal statement at Lund, which had as its superscription: "Confessing the 'Truth' in a confused World." Quote: "Christ's Church on earth is divided into a

multiplicity of separate churches. The reason for this is not to be found simply in the superabundant riches of the Gospel, but also in human sin." That is the first time we have ever heard the Gospel of Christ blamed, in part at least, for the disunity of the Church.

But the Lundensians go on: "Consequently, the prayer of our Lord, 'Ut omnes unum sint' (that they all may be one), constitutes a call to repentance for all churches, that puts them under a vital obligation to strive for the realization of unity." You will here note that they fail, as the Unionist is wont to do, to quote the complete utterance of our Lord in this matter. He does not merely say: "Ut omnes unum sint," but immediately adds: "Sicut tu Pater in me, et ego in te" (even as Thou, Father, in me, and I in Thee). We must not make Christ out to be a Unionist. His desire and prayer is, that there may be perfect unity, as that which existed between Him and the Father.

And as for repentance, are we to repent of the fact that we have (as have our true fathers in Christ before us) claimed that we did have the full truth of the Gospel? There are many sins which all of us shall have to repent of, yes, every day of our life. But God forbid that we should have to offer the fifth petition after we have been obedient to the apostolic admonition: "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." 1 Pet. 4, 11.

But then comes the closing statement of that Lundensian paragraph: "No church, however, must let itself be led by its concern for unity to surrender anything of the truth that has been entrusted to it." If the Lund theologians had taken that statement seriously they would not be wending their way to that Babel of clerical confusion convening at Amsterdam this very month. They would then, rather than chant the modernist's battle-cry, "Vorwärts nach Amsterdam," take to heart Jeremiah's serious admonition: "Stand ye in the ways, and see," praying with Eberhard Fischer in one of your treasured German hymns:

„Bewahr' vor Ketzerei, vor Menschenlehr' und Dünkel!
 Lehr' uns nach deiner Art im Tempel, nicht im Winkel!
 Behüt' vor Aergernis, vor Spaltung, die uns trennt;
 Erhalte rein und ganz dein Wort und Sakrament!"

Which might be rendered freely:

“Guard us from heresy,
Hypocrisy e'er shunning,
Teach us to speak as Christ,
Who spurned all human cunning.
O keep us from offense,
Which falsehood e'er has sent,
Preserve unto us pure
Thy word and sacrament!”

2. *But the second crying need of our beloved Conference is to realize again that all things old are not necessarily passé.* For, says the prophet: “Ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein.” To the present-day Unionist and Syncretist the words of Isaiah are as applicable as they were to an apostate Israel of his day: “To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” Isa. 8, 20.

Well might we make the sainted Daniel March's statement our own: “The Bible is the oldest and the newest of books. It surveys the whole field of time, and looks farthest into the infinite depths of eternity. It lends the most vivid and absorbing interest to the scenes and events of the past, and it keeps us in the most active sympathy with the time in which we live. It gives us the most reliable record of what has been, and it affords us our only means of knowing what is yet to be. It is so conservative as to make it a solemn duty to study and revere the past, and it is so progressive as to be in advance of the most enlightened age. It is strict enough to denounce the very shadow and semblance of sin, and it is liberal enough to save the chiefest of sinners. It is full of God, and must therefore be read with a pure heart or its true glory will not be seen. It is full of man, and must therefore always be interesting and instructive to all who would know themselves.”

It is not only the European churches bearing the Lutheran name who are so under the spell of Barthian theology that they imagine, the only way to ensconce themselves against the threats of a resurgent Rome is to unite so-called Evangelicals; that spirit of surrendering the *sola Scriptura* of a Luther and his fel-

low reformers is making itself felt throughout large sections of American Lutheranism. And what is at the root of it all? May it not be that there has been too little study of Martin Luther in our seminaries of late, too little searching of that monument to the Christian faith, the Book of Concord? Listening recently to a debate on the question of entering or not entering the World Council of Churches at a convention of the largest church body among the Scandinavians in this country, we heard repeated allusions to the Confessions from the lips of many speakers, but not a single one of them (though there were four of their theological professors taking part in that debate) mentioned so much as a syllable from the Formula of Concord or our Smalcald Articles.

What was it that made a Walther the tower of strength which he became in our American Lutheran Zion? Walther was an assiduous student of Luther, even as a Luther had been but an humble follower of Paul. Yes, we hear ever so often, even within our Synodical Conference: "Let us forget the fathers, and get back to Scripture." Again that may sound very pious and praiseworthy. But what if Scripture, to which they appeal, has something to say about those fathers who have spoken unto us the word of God? Can we then do as we please about what they have spoken? Not unless we want to violate the injunction of the Word itself. And this is what Holy Writ enjoins upon us all: "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God: whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation." Heb. 13, 7.

Again we can sympathize with those who bemoan the fact that the Missouri Synod has suffered from what they call "isolationism," that it is being threatened by "narrow legalism," that the bane of Lutheran theology has been the formulation of doctrinal theses, that it is the lack of true scholarship which lies at the root of our troubles in these unionistic times.

Is it isolationism to hold aloof from those whom God Himself has admonished not to fraternize? Is it narrow legalism to be bound to the clear-cut statements of our Lutheran Confessions? A Niemoeller may tell us that "God is not bound by any such confessions." But God *is* bound by His Word. And until it be

shown that the Confessions to which we stand pledged are not a proper exposition of that Word, let us not be over-troubled by those who accuse us of sixteenth century confessionalism. Let us continue to ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein. Would you say that when an honest and Scripture-true Walther, in his struggle for the pure doctrine of *objective justification*, answered Stelhorn's false assertion on this point: „Erst muss der Mensch glauben, dann wird er gerechtfertigt" with the simple thesis: "*Justificatio non post fidem, sed per fidem*" — would you say that this was the bane of Lutheran theology?

Is it true that there "at bottom is something off-center in the morality of those who are laboring to destroy the union resolutions of 1938"? If such a reading of hearts were to be accepted as our guiding star in the troublous times which beset us, then Missouri itself would stand adjudged as off-center in its morality when it at its 1947 convention declared "that the 1938 resolutions shall no longer be considered as a basis for the purpose of establishing fellowship with the American Lutheran Church." (Mo. Report, 1947, p. 510.)

The unionist may cry "love" all he pleases, and tell us that Rom. 16, 17 "does not apply to the present situation in the Lutheran Church of America." He may tell us that Missouri was all wrong when it set Rom. 16, 17 before the church as the great fundamental proof text against unionism. But then he must not seek to hide under the aegis of a Luther, a Walther, a Pieper. Pieper *did* consider Rom. 16, 17 as a fundamental proof text against unionism, as did a Walther, and as does the Missouri Synod to this day in its *Brief Statement*. And we are not endangering our Christian faith when we hark back to a Luther on this score. For Luther had somewhat to say, not only on Rom. 16, 17, but also on the matter of the unionist's "love." "Cursed be the love," says Luther, "which would be preserved to the hurt of the doctrine of faith, for which all must step aside, love, apostles, angels from heaven." (St. L. Walch, IX, 645.) And why could Luther speak thus? Because he believed with his whole heart what God had taught him: "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart: thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neigh-

bor, and not suffer sin upon him." Lev. 19, 17. Yes, we know that "love suffereth long and is kind." But if it be the love of which Paul speaks in 1 Cor. 13, it is a love which will not suffer the dissimulation of a brother so much as for an hour (Gal. 2, 6), that the truth of the Gospel might continue with that brother.

And let no one come with the specious argument that we are in danger of losing the precious Gospel for lack of modern scholarship. It isn't lack of what some choose to call "scholarship" as it is lack of humbly accepting what Scripture plainly teaches. Let our sainted Dr. Koren's words, spoken to our synod in his farewell address in Chicago in 1908, be sounded forth again: "According to Scripture, we have reason to be certain that many an unschooled man and woman, and by the world despised, has gotten farther in the knowledge of God and His will than have the vast majority of the most learned pastors and professors. To all of us Jesus has said: 'Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.'" (Koren's Samlede Skrifter, II, p. 317.) What we need in these days of sore distress is to ask for the old paths, yea, to make Brorson's prayer our own:

"O Holy Ghost, to Thee, our light,
We cry by day, by night:
Come, grant us of the light and power
Our fathers had of yore;
When Thy dear Church did stand
A tree deep-rooted, grand;
Full-crowned with blossoms white as snow,
With purple fruits aglow!"

3. *And why all this? Because we have but one objective, as a Church and as individual Christians — to bring sin-burdened souls rest.* It is only when we have heeded the prophet's counsel, standing in the ways and seeing, asking for the old paths, where is the good way, and walking therein, that we shall find rest for our souls.

Now let me ask you: Will it bring rest to sin-burdened souls to be told that our "conversion and salvation is not in every respect due to God's grace alone"? Will it give them rest to be told that "we don't feel as desperately wicked as our fathers felt

— most of us are trying to do the best we can — there is no use attempting to induce in us a sense of absolute and utter depravity”? Will it give them rest to be told that “the glory of Christianity emerged from a mass of idolatry and superstition”? Will it give them rest to be told that “the understanding of Scripture by the Church, and especially by those who have been called upon to interpret Scripture, precedes the understanding by the individual member”?

And where do we find the cited quotations? Do they come from Rome or from the Federal Council of Churches? Alas, they are the statements of theologians who claimed to be Lutheran, but who here deny the doctrine of *sola gratia*, the doctrine of man’s *natural depravity*, the doctrine of the *divine origin* of the Church, the doctrine of the *clarity of Scripture*. In other words, Lutheran *in name* only!

But in this welter of confused teaching and preaching comes the comforting voice of Him who alone can bring rest to sin-sick souls. And what does He say? Pointing to the same rest concerning which our text speaks, He invites all, whether they be learned or unlearned, rich or poor, high or low: “Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest for your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.” Matt. 11, 28-30. What will our answer be in these days of sad confusion? “That yoke we wish to carry, that burden we ask the privilege of bearing, since it has the divine promise of eternal rest.”

As we began this sermon with the words of our beloved Walther, so permit us to close with the words which sounded forth in that first Synodical Conference address more than three quarters of a century ago: “Not rest and peace in this world, but struggle and strife, not honor and glory, but disgrace and abuse await us from all sides, not only from the unbelieving world, from the heretical and fanatical sects and from the anti-Christian papacy, but even from many who are the children with us of a common mother, who bear our name and have a like confessional banner floating over them.”

But despite it all, our confident prayer shall continue to ascend to the throne of grace in the words of our beloved Kingo:

“Let me never, Lord, forsake Thee,
E'en though bitter pain and strife
On my way shall overtake me;
But may I through all my life
Walk in fervent love to Thee,
In all woes for comfort flee
To Thy birth, Thy death and passion,
Till I see Thy full salvation.”

Amen.

NORMAN A. MADSON.

ANCIENT HERESIES IN MODERN GARB

The undersigned was asked to deliver a paper on this topic for the 1948 Convention of the Nebraska District. It is at the request of the District that the major part of the essay is being repeated here. Some parts have been recast and shortened. If other sections still offer what the professional reader may consider unnecessary detail, that will be understood in view of the fact that the convention included a substantial number of laymen.

The general purpose of the essay was to show that much of what passes as modern, liberal, and progressive thought in the field of religion is often nothing more than a revival of previous attempts to overthrow or devitalize the blessed Gospel of salvation, and thus to counteract these attacks by aiding the hearer to recognize these errors in their modern form and to understand their subversive character. This line of thought was determined by the solemn warning of St. Paul (Acts 20) concerning the “grievous wolves” which would enter after his departing, not sparing the flock. *“Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, and remember that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears.”* Attention was also drawn to the measures for defense which the Apostle pointed out on the same occasion: *“And now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able*

to build you up.” We shall do well to note this for our own study. It is good to know something about the ancient heresies. It is better to be able to recognize them also in their modern form. But unless we ourselves are deeply rooted in the Word of His Grace, in the Gospel of Salvation through the Blood of the Son of God, all this head knowledge will avail us nothing. The blessed inheritance of which Paul speaks will slip from our nerveless fingers and will be lost just as surely as though it were torn from us by the very hands of Anti-Christ himself.

The paper did not attempt to take up all the heresies which have risen to distress the Church. Three groups of errors were selected, chiefly because of the particular bearing which they have on our modern times. They are first those heresies which assail the eternal Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ, then those which limit the implications of the Fall of Man, and finally those which challenge the finality of Biblical Revelation. They will be treated in this same order in successive issues of our *Quartalschrift*.

I. Heresies Which Assail the Eternal Deity of Christ

In view of the many passages of Scripture which speak of the eternal Godhead of Jesus Christ it seems strange indeed that this doctrine should ever have been questioned among Christians. In the great Prolog to his Gospel St. John speaks of the Savior as the *Logos*, the Word, and then proceeds to say that the Word was God. He concludes his First Epistle by a solemn declaration that “this (Jesus Christ) is the true God and eternal life.” Thomas addressed the risen Christ as his Lord and his God. Paul speaks of “the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior, Jesus Christ” (Tit. 2:13) and (Rom. 9:5) declares: “Christ is over all, God blessed forever.” These passages are certainly conclusive and wondrously precious to us, since our salvation would not be secure if it had been entrusted to lesser hands than those of a Savior who is fully divine. — It is certain that on the basis of these and similar passages the early Christians, generally speaking, looked at Jesus Christ as being true God. They worshiped Him, they prayed to Him, they died for Him. And yet it was in those same days that the voice of dissent began to be heard.

At first it came from a rather remote and insignificant part of the Church, from a mere segment of Jewish Christianity, which itself had long since been overshadowed by the Church of the Gentiles. But even among these Jewish Christians there were many who, while they clung to the old Mosaic Law of their fathers, did not demand that it be imposed upon their non-Jewish brethren. This particular group, however, called Ebionites, not only demanded such obedience from the Gentiles, but denounced the Apostle Paul because he had proclaimed the liberty with which Christ has made us free, and had told his people that they should let no man judge them in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days. It is likely that these extremists were related in thought and spirit to those Judaizing teachers who had caused Paul so much trouble in Galatia, when they sought to make circumcision obligatory upon the Gentile Christians. Be this as it may, their influence was dwindling fast when Justin Martyr, who lived about a century after St. Paul, had the following to say about them in one of his writings: "There are some of your own (*i. e.*, Jewish) race who confess that He is Christ but maintain *that He was born a man from men.*" (Machen, *The Virgin Birth*, p. 15.) Here we have the first denial of the Godhead of Jesus Christ. They recognized Him as the promised Messiah, but did not accept the conclusion that therefore He was divine. A later writer, Hippolytus, explains that they believed that Jesus became Christ by practicing the Law, and that it is possible for them to become Christs by doing likewise. (*Ibid.*, p. 20.) In their zeal for the Law they had come to a point where they saw Christ primarily as a teacher and an example for their own conduct, rather than the Atoning Sacrifice for the sins of the world. Their attention was on what they would do for God, rather than what God had done for them. They sought salvation, but they sought it by character.

The Ebionites soon passed from the scene, but not their error. It was at this time that the teachers of the Church became deeply concerned about another matter. Christianity had enjoyed a certain amount of respect because it taught, even as did also the Jews, that the God of the Bible is One God. For the philosophers of the Greek and Roman world had been rather successful

in discrediting the old pagan idea of a heaven that is filled with many gods. But now these Christian teachers seemed to fear that their faithfulness to the idea of monotheism was being doubted. They felt that somehow they had to explain that in worshipping Jesus Christ, in baptizing not only in the name of the Father and the Son, but also the Holy Ghost, Christianity had not fallen into worshipping two or even three gods, had not become guilty of polytheism, but was still true to the idea of the One God. Different explanations were suggested, which we need not discuss at length: that Jesus Christ, though divine, was nevertheless distinctly subordinate to the Father, and therefore not to be considered His equal; or that there was only One God, who however took on different forms, played different roles, as the occasion required, being once the Father, then the Son, then again the Holy Ghost. Because by this explanation the Oneness, the *monarchy*, of God was safeguarded, this doctrine was called Monarchianism. Because of this explanation of the different forms, or *modes*, which God was said to have adopted at various times, it was called Modalistic Monarchianism. But then came another type of Monarchianism in which we recognize the old Ebionite error in a new dress. Again it was taught that Christ was a mere man among men, but one in whom the power of God was particularly active, who employed this gift of power with the highest degree of faithfulness, and who eventually, because of his faithful use of this gift of divine power, was adopted by God as His Son. This was subsequently called Dynamic (or Dynamistic) Monarchianism, or simply Dynamism. Another name that fits rather well is Adoptianism. Both names make it clear that whatever one might see of divine qualities in Jesus Christ was in the nature of a gift, or a subsequent development. The eternal Godhead was explained away.

The outstanding spokesman of this school of thought was Paul of Samosata. He was one of the most colorful figures of his day. At the time of which we are speaking, about the middle of the third century, Paul was the metropolitan bishop of Antioch, on the eastern shore of the Mediterranean Sea, a city that was second only to Rome in importance and splendor. It was the same Antioch where the Apostle Paul had labored together with Barnabas, and where the first congregation of Gentile Christians had

been established. It was from Antioch that the Apostle Paul had been sent on his great missionary journeys. It still was often spoken of as the Mother Church of Gentile Christianity, and had far surpassed Jerusalem in importance and influence. At the same time Antioch was one of the three great centers of Christian learning of that time. Certainly the voice of its bishop carried great weight. In addition to all this Paul also held political office. He was the chief adviser or Prime Minister of Queen Zenobia of Palmyra, a desert kingdom lying halfway between Damascus and Mesopotamia, which in this period had become strong enough to enable its queen not only to defy the authority of distant Rome, but to become the virtual ruler of the eastern part of the Roman Empire. It is to the credit of the Church of that day that the heresy of Paul was attacked, exposed, and finally condemned while he still enjoyed the favor of this powerful queen. It was about four years later, in 272, that the Emperor Aurelian brought about the military defeat of Zenobia, carrying her to Rome as a captive. Only then was it possible to remove the bishop from his position of influence.

The error of Paul was well concealed and stubbornly defended. Where earlier Dynamists had spoken of a divine power that came upon Jesus at some later stage of His life, perhaps on the occasion of His baptism by John, Paul claimed that this had occurred at the birth of Jesus. To make the matter even more difficult, he used as name for this power the same expression which John uses when he calls the eternal Son of God the "Word." But instead of recognizing this LOGOS as a person, as in fact the Second Person of the Godhead, as the Son of the Father from eternity, Paul explained the term LOGOS as meaning the mind or reason of God. The fact that John later calls Him the Only Begotten of the Father, in other words the Son of God, was interpreted by him in a figurative sense, as one may say of any man that he is the father of a certain thought. Thereby Paul of Samosata paved the way for his main point, namely that the child to which Mary gave birth was a truly human child, and only human. In Him the Word (LOGOS) was made flesh. But according to Paul that did not make Him a divine person. It only gave Him the gift and power of divine thought. Using this gift faith-

fully, He was raised from the dead, was given divine authority, and was appointed to be the judge and savior of men, so that He might now be recognized and worshiped as Lord. We are told (McGiffert, *History of Christian Thought*, I, 244) that "Paul was even willing that he should be given the name of God if it were clearly understood that he was not God in himself but had only been granted the title and honor that went with it as a reward for his virtue and the constancy of his devotion to the divine will." It is clear that Paul was deeply concerned about picturing Christ as a great teacher and a splendid example. But it is equally clear that the Saviorship of Jesus, as this bishop conceived it, lay in the teaching rather than in the sacrifice of Christ. He was stressing the prophetic office at the expense of the priestly. Man will be saved not because Christ died for him, but only to the degree that he begins to live like Christ. Thus it becomes clear how the error of Paul strikes at the very heart of the Gospel. We understand why the Augsburg Confession lists "*Samosatenos*" among the errorists whose teachings are specifically rejected in its very first article.

After the downfall of Paul it was generally accepted that the LOGOS of John must refer to a person, to a pre-existent divine person who became flesh and was made man through being born of the Virgin Mary. It would seem as though the last loophole for error had been stopped, at least as far as the eternal Godhead of Christ was concerned. But the spirit of Paul lived on, for instance in a famous teacher, Lucian, who was head of the theological school at Antioch. Yet the new form of the error did not come to a head until early in the IV. Century, when one of Lucian's pupils, a presbyter of Alexandria by the name of Arius, became the storm center of a new controversy. Arius accepted the view that the LOGOS was a person who existed long before the birth of the Savior. He could therefore speak of a pre-existent Christ, of a LOGOS apart from the flesh, who subsequently became the LOGOS in the flesh, the Incarnate Word. All of this is Biblical teaching, and a distinct change from the views of Paul of Samosata. But when Arius, following the pattern of his teacher Lucian, began to explain just what kind of a personal being this pre-existent LOGOS was, the error became apparent. For Arius

taught emphatically that this Godlike person, whom he also called the Son, was a created being, made out of nothing, and that he did not share the essence or the substance of God. He considered him a personal being intermediate between God and man, and of another nature altogether. He maintained that He was not eternal, but created in time. When He became man, no union of divine and human natures was thereby effected. He was to save men, but only by revealing the will of God and announcing His judgment, thereby leading them to repentance and obedience. Obviously this would leave much to be done by man himself, for it is he who must put the teachings into practice and thereby demonstrate his obedience. But for the same reason it would detract from the blessed doctrine that our salvation is the work of Jesus Christ alone, that His grace is sufficient. Christianity as Arius taught it was primarily an ethical system and therefore failed to emphasize that distinctive Gospel of salvation by grace, through faith, without works, which sets it apart from all other religions of the world.

This was soon sensed by others and became the reason for charges of heresy which were preferred against Arius by his aged bishop, Alexander of Alexandria, and led to proceedings by which Arius was condemned as a false teacher at a large synod held in Alexandria in 321. The matter did not end there, however. Arius had many sympathizers, particularly among his "fellow-Lucianists," as the former pupils of that famous teacher called themselves. Thus the controversy spread, until it came to the ears of the Emperor Constantine, who had just succeeded in bringing the Roman Empire under his control. In his struggles for power he had cast his lot with Christianity, against his brother-in-law Licinius, who had tried to rally the forces of paganism to his support. Constantine's victory had brought a new status to the Church, which now for the first time, after centuries of bitter persecution, became not only a recognized, but eventually the established religion of the State. For these favors Constantine, however, wanted a price. The Church should settle its own differences and thus provide him with a united basis for the support of his power. In this connection it may be interesting to hear a letter addressed by the Emperor to Alexander and Arius, and transmitted to them by a Spanish bishop, Hosius of Cordova, who

was his trusted advisor in matters of religion. In this message the Emperor states:

“As I hear, the current controversy began with this that you, Alexander, asked the presbyters what each of them thought about a certain passage in Scripture, or rather that you wanted to hear their opinion about some idle question, and that you, Arius, thoughtlessly answered with something that you should never have thought, or if you had thought it, should have kept to yourself. Thus your disagreement began; the fellowship was denied; the holy people became divided; the members of a common body who had previously been of one mind now separated from each other. Now each of you should in the same degree yield, and accept the admonition which I, your fellow-servant, now address to you; and that is the following: Such questions should never have been brought up as a subject for discussion; but once it had been done, no decision in these matters should ever have been permitted; for they do not arise out of the compulsion of some law, but they are the product of idle speculation. And if they ever should be brought up for the sake of providing the intellect with some exercise, we must so to speak lock them up in the innermost recesses of the heart, never thoughtlessly carrying them out into the assembly of the people and heedlessly bringing them to the ears of the masses.”

Surely, if any argument is needed against a mingling of Church and State, we have it here!

When these persuasions failed, Constantine convoked a general Council of the Church, the First Ecumenical Council, as it is called. It met in Nicea, near enough to Constantinople so that the Emperor could attend when he wished, and particularly also keep a watchful eye on the proceedings. At this Council Athanasius was the chief spokesman against Arius, stressing constantly the manner in which this denial of the full Godhead of the Savior robs Christians of their complete assurance of salvation. To him the Godhead of Christ was the solemn guarantee that the Lord

who died for us was not merely a well-intentioned would-be Savior, but a Savior in fact and in truth. This point of view governed his entire thinking and was the reason why he could not compromise with Arianism in any form. For while the immediate findings of the Council of Nicea were favorable to the cause of orthodoxy, yet Arianism was by no means dead. In fact, in a certain sense the victory of Nicea had been premature, gained only because the Emperor happened to be listening to a conservative advisor at the time. Later, when friends of Arius gained his attention and favor, the tide turned, and the readmission of Arius into the Church was forestalled only by his sudden death. During more than forty years after Nicea the struggle surged to and fro. Five times Athanasius went into exile because he would not bow to the whims of the Imperial Court.

In the meantime Arianism took on a wide variety of forms. Some of its adherents became very extreme and radical in their views. While Arius had been content to say that the substance of the Son was not the same as that of the Father, these extremists emphasized the difference as strongly as they could. Others were more moderate. While not ready to grant the full and complete Godhead of the Son, they nevertheless were ready to bring Him as close to the nature of the Father as they could without attributing full deity to Him. They spoke very persuasively of His being like unto the Father. Yet to Athanasius it made no difference whether men missed the mark by a wide margin or came nearer to the truth. As long as they wilfully withheld from the Savior the tribute that He is true God, begotten of the Father from eternity, Athanasius held that they were striking at the foundations of Christian faith. That was the one principle which he could not surrender. However, when it became clear that a moderate group was actually saying and teaching the same things as those for which Athanasius and his associates had stood so long and so faithfully, then he was quick to extend to them the hand of fellowship in spite of the fact that they were not using the same terminology which he had employed.

The Nicene Creed which is familiar to us from our church services is a standing reminder of those stirring days. When we hear the sonorous words with which we confess that our Lord

Jesus Christ is "God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father," then let us thank God from the bottom of our hearts for the faithfulness of those ancient Fathers of the Church who so steadfastly stood for the truth of God's Word, and against the plausible arguments of reason which would make our Lord anything less than a Divine Savior. They fought to preserve for us the certainty of our salvation.

* * * *

From the foregoing it should be clear that the denial of the eternal deity of Jesus Christ may take many different forms. It may consist of a flagrant denial of the Virgin Birth of our Lord, or it may withhold His divine glory from Him by a subtle change in the interpretation of the Biblical terms. It may speak of a divine influence or power which came upon Jesus and do it in such a way that it limits this thought to the later period of His public ministry, or it may attribute it to the entire life of Jesus, seeing this power as something that came upon Him at birth. It may confess, or it may deny the pre-existence of Christ. The error may result from a misguided attempt to emphasize the teaching and the example of Christ, or it may be inspired by a desire to present a reasonable and understandable picture of this central figure of the New Testament. But in any and all of these various forms of error we still have the same common denominator: in one way or another the Godhood of our Lord and Savior is challenged and contested. If we now prepare to trace this heresy in its modern garb, we must be prepared to find it taking a similar variety of forms. Though this will add to the difficulty of our quest, yet we may not shun the effort involved, for certainly the error is as deadly as ever. The Gospel of our Redemption is still at stake.

During the centuries that followed Nicea there were only isolated instances of a revival of this error. But in the days of the Reformation there appeared disquieting symptoms of a trend toward radicalism and rationalism that did not hesitate to voice its doubts about a doctrine which ran so completely counter to all reason as does that of the Trinity. The old ideas of a Christ who

is something less than true God came to be heard again, and there was ample cause for the warning of the Augsburg Confession against "Arians, Eunomians, and Samosatenes, old and new." The last was a pointed reference to the teachings of certain Anabaptists like Denk, Hetzer, and Campanus, all of whom followed in the steps of Paul of Samosata. The Spanish physician Michael Servetus, whom Calvin burnt at the stake in Geneva for his heresy, might also be mentioned in this connection, although his views ran along somewhat different lines. But it was toward the end of the Reformation century that the movement took on greater proportions. Two Italian noblemen by the name of Sozzini, uncle and nephew, taught that God is but a single person, and that Jesus Christ was a mere man, though endowed with gifts of the highest order, gifts which He employed so faithfully that as a reward divine honors were conferred upon Him. Because it was contrary to reason they also denied His Virgin Birth. Nor did they have any room in their system for a pre-existent Christ, so that the Incarnation became a dead letter to them. Italy soon became too hot for them, but they found refuge in Poland, and soon gathered a considerable following there, also in Eastern Hungary. Their appeal was definitely to the upper classes. Their doctrine emphasized the rule of reason. Their interest in Christianity was to bring it into harmony with their rational principle. They might be called the first of the modern Unitarians.

Generally this term is reserved, however, for a movement that had its origin in England in the XVIIth century and which in the XVIIIth led to the organization of the American Unitarian Church. Lindsay and Priestly in England, and Channing, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and Parker in America were the leaders who gave the movement its direction. As their name implies, they rejected the idea that more than one person might be worshiped as God. Limiting this tribute exclusively to the Father, they emphasized the strict humanity of Jesus Christ. Praising Him as a great teacher and as an example to inspire men to similar deeds, they nevertheless denied to Him the name and nature of God. In doing so they were following the old Socinian principle

which made reason the supreme guide of man, even in matters of religion.

The doctrine which suffered most at their hands was that of the vicarious atonement of Christ. The sacrifice made on the Cross, which has saving power and value only when it is the suffering and death of One who was not only true man, but at the same time the eternal Son of God (1 John 1:7), did not conform to the yardstick of their reason. Channing, who had many a warm word of praise for Christ ("I believe him to be more than a human being, . . . having received gifts . . . granted to no other." Quoted in Neve, *Churches and Sects*, 550) nevertheless describes the doctrine of the atonement as an attempt to "erect a gallows in the center of the universe." This remark reminds one of those liberals of our day who speak of salvation by the Blood of Christ as "slaughter-house religion." As a result, Christianity was reduced to the level of a code of ethics, a doctrine of morality, where man rises to higher levels by following the lead of the "divine" teacher, Jesus of Nazareth, — or of others gifted with similar light. A modern Unitarian, Dr. H. Westwood, wrote a tract called "The Problem of Salvation," in which he says, "The tragic mistake has been in limiting the incarnation to Jesus of Nazareth." He goes on to say that "every social worker is a savior. Instead of one Savior we have many Saviors." He states that man must get away from "the idea of a Deliverer, or a Strong One, or a Savior, through whom the work of salvation would be accomplished." Making the point that one must not seek salvation by *believing* in Christ, but rather by *doing* what He teaches, he continues: "Some day the historian will write a history of the influence of the doctrine of the atonement (*i. e.*, the doctrine of the imputed merit of Christ) upon human institutions, and I venture the assertion that to it he will attribute many of the failures of civilization that mar both the present and the long ages of the past" (quoted in Neve, *op. cit.* 559f.). In other words, the Gospel of a Crucified Savior is blamed for the ills of the world! That this can only lead to an insufferably complacent and self-satisfied Pharisaic work-righteousness is inevitable. Among many other quotations we find the following: "We are too busy with doing good for troubling ourselves with

the matter of eternal salvation." (Ibid., p. 560.) It is only a short step from the smooth smugness of this statement to an attitude toward all revealed religion which is expressed in what *Time* (May 24, 1948) calls "an old wisecrack: Unitarians believe that there is, at the most, one God."

It is clear that their principle of the supreme guidance of reason has led them far away from the original Truth of Scripture. It is a severe, but by no means undeserved judgment when it is said that they no longer are to be considered a Christian Church. But one may ask whether they deserve the amount of attention which we have given them in this paper. After all, they are not a large body. Nor have they shown any particular tendency to grow. Together with their intellectual cousins, the Universalists, they are still outnumbered by the membership of our three Wisconsin districts. Can they really do much harm?

The best answer to this question of which I know was given by a Unitarian minister whose name I have long since forgotten, but who, in one of our national magazines, pointed out that since religious liberalism, or Modernism, has become firmly entrenched in most Protestant denominations, Unitarians could well afford to disband, would perhaps be inclined to do so if it were not for the fact that they wish to continue in their function of still further widening the range of liberal religious thought. He pointed with pride to the fact that their strictly humanitarian views concerning the person of Christ, as well as their insistence on man's being saved by his own work rather than by the work of a Divine Redeemer are being preached from an ever increasing number of Protestant pulpits. Only old-fashioned Fundamentalists are still raising their voices in protest, and he considers theirs a losing fight.

There certainly is much truth in this exultant statement. If one considers the change that sectarian Protestantism has undergone, the way in which the Inspiration of Scripture, the doctrine of the Virgin Birth and of the Deity of Christ, the centrality and reality of the Atonement, and the credibility of the miracles of Scripture have been challenged with ever increasing boldness, if one further considers how the modern demand is for deeds rather than creeds, for a Gospel which is active in the social field,

for a general rethinking of the old religious values, then one must realize that the words of this Unitarian are far from being an idle boast. For what we have in these modern developments is Unitarianism, Unitarianism under wraps, a Unitarianism which perhaps still shies from accepting the name, but genuine Unitarianism nevertheless.

It is sometimes hard to recognize because of the manner in which old and familiar expressions are still employed. But if one will only take the trouble to look closely, the identifying marks of rational religion are there. Years ago I heard a Good Friday sermon by one of the leading liberal preachers of the day. He spoke on the Crucifixion, showing first that it compels one to come to grips with the question of sin, and then that it shows the way of triumphing over sin. He used the story to show the depths of sin of which man is capable, since there was no just cause for this act of cruelty and violence. Then he showed the triumph over sin of which man is capable, pointing to the manner in which Christ rose above this sin in His prayer to the Father, Forgive them for they know not what they do. So we must rise above the sin and evil of our day and develop the good that is in man, rather than the evil. This was about the line of thought. Not a word about the fact that the Lord had laid on Him the iniquity of us all. Not a word about the forgiveness that is ours because He was wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities. Not a word about the way in which God's wrath over us was stilled by the perfect sacrifice that was offered. A Unitarian critic could have placed the stamp of complete approval upon the sermon. A thoughtful Christian can not.

The denial of the eternal Deity of Jesus Christ occurs also in an entirely different quarter, the group that calls itself by the name of Jehovah's Witnesses. Following the views of their founder, Charles T. Russell, this group still stands by the statement in which he declared the accepted view of the Trinity to be "well suited to the dark ages which it helped to produce," calling it "trinitarian nonsense . . . foisted upon the Lord's people to bewilder and mystify them." (Quoted in Neve, *op. cit.* 582.) Concerning Christ he says: "Jesus is only a creature of God, and not the Son of God from all eternity; and now, since his death,

the God-man no longer lives." . . . "It was necessary not only that the man Christ Jesus should die — but just as necessary that the man Christ Jesus should never live again — shall remain dead to all eternity." And yet this group teaches an existence of Jesus before He became man. But according to Russell the "spiritual" being that existed before the birth of Jesus was not God, was not begotten of Him, but was His highest creature, the Archangel Michael. Only after the death of Jesus Christ did God create a new being, neither God, nor man, but "divine" in the sense of being God-like. Whatever else one may think of these views of Russell, he certainly succeeded in combining in his picture of Christ the Adoptianism of Paul of Samosata, the pre-existence doctrine of Arius, and some distinctly original contributions of his own.

In conclusion of this phase of our study we must consider the various secret orders which make use of the name of God in their rituals and prayers, or organizations like the Boy Scouts of America which use this name in their Law and Oath upon which they base their character training. The question is complicated somewhat by the fact that most lodges are completely indifferent to the church affiliation of their members, while the Scout organization has made definite efforts to turn the religious part of the training of their troops over to the various religious organizations of the land. With almost no exception these secret orders carefully omit any reference to Jesus Christ in their prescribed rituals. The question for us in this paper is whether this fact may be construed as involving a denial of the Deity of Christ. It would almost seem far-fetched to do so.

In order to understand these strangely uniform and consistent references to God, to a Supreme Being, to the Great Architect of the Universe, it is necessary to refer to a religious philosophy called Deism, which flourished in England and France, beginning some two centuries ago. The problem which these philosophers sought to solve was why there are so many different religions in the world, religions which still have many common characteristics. The answer at which they finally arrived was, as their name indicates, that there must indeed be a Supreme Being, a Great Architect, a God who created this world. But they con-

cluded that when this God had completed this work of creation, He withdrew into an infinite Beyond, leaving this world to itself, to function by virtue of the forces which He had set in motion, about as a watchmaker will wind a timepiece and then turn it over, as a going concern, to its new custodian, to run as long as it may.

Because of this withdrawal of the Creating God they held that no man and no group of men has an authentic, accurate knowledge of Him, since according to their views He has not revealed Himself to anyone. All that men have is a vague memory, an intuitive knowledge of God. (St. Paul indeed says as much in his opening chapters of Romans.) In the absence of any positive information or revelation, men then constructed their own religions as best they could, on the basis of these remnants of an old memory. Some of these were inferior, others quite superior, particularly Christianity, of which most of these Deists spoke quite kindly. But in their estimation all of these religions were man-made, and their teachers were men among men. There was no room in the Deists' system for a Christ who was true God, a Son in whom God revealed Himself and spoke to this world. True religion could only be determined by comparing all these various religions with each other, and from their common factors drawing the outlines of the true picture. Thus they came to speak of a religion of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, of a religion which stressed the need for moral conduct on the part of man, not only for the sake of making this world a better place to live in, but also because of man's accountability to his God. Thus they came to speak of a hereafter and, in the absence of any other revelation, concluded that he who lives the moral code will eventually find himself in that hereafter.

It will be said that this is simply the natural religion of man, implanted in the hearts of man by God Himself. It is that, indeed, and as such we have no quarrel with it. But the complicating factor lies in the fact that Deism not only to all intents and purposes places Christ into the same category with Moses, Mohammed, Buddha, Confucius, Lao Tze, or any other great religious leader one might name, but that it denies the very Deity

of Christ as a matter of principle, since its basic premise is that God has left no revelation of Himself.

When lodge rituals therefore carefully omit any reference to Christ, it is not merely because it might precipitate a controversy, perhaps by offending some Jewish member who does not accept Jesus as the Messiah. It is rather because for the authors of these rituals it was a matter of principle, a part of their Deistic philosophy, that Christ is not to be thought of, honored, or worshiped as God. They claimed for themselves a higher, clearer concept of God than that of Scripture. And when Scouting is perfectly willing to leave the religious training of boys to their respective religious organizations, and shows itself broadminded enough to include not only the various denominations of Christianity, but also any number of non-Christian religions, it is again acting in perfect agreement with Deistic views and principles, namely that Christ is only one among many religious leaders and teachers, and that there are others which are also sufficiently ethical and noble to serve for the moral betterment of their followers. But it is this very view which, as we have seen, denies to our Lord the divine honor which is His rightful due.

There has been perhaps no period in the history of the world when the denial of the Godhead of our Savior has been so widespread and so insidious. We need to preach Jesus Christ, the Son of God, as never before. We need to be on guard against any possible denial of Christ, for our own sake as well as for the sake of those souls which the Lord has entrusted to our care. For thus saith our Lord: "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth" (Luke 11:23).

E. REIM.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN AN ECONOMIC SOCIETY

The Idea of Religious Liberty

In discussing religious liberty the idea must not be confused with the concept of freedom of thought and speech. The former is a juridical principle and the latter is a philosophic creed. While both concepts are not unrelated in their historical evolution, the

doctrine of religious liberty has its reason in a different source. It is definitely the reaction to an effort to compel by the exercise of governmental and ecclesiastical power uniformity and conformity in matters of religious faith and dogma. In spite of Luther's 'Liberty of the Christian Man' the Church continued to insist that religion was the business of the political organization, since both the Church and the State were of divine institution.

In our thesis of religious liberty we shall proceed on the theory that it is a political concept and should not be identified with ecclesiastical or theological liberty. Hence like any other political theory it cannot escape the influence of the prevailing ideologies and *mores*, even as it could not, for instance, escape the contemporaneous political phenomenon of the democratic process in the thinking of modern society. If the assumption is valid, then the present fact of religious liberty does not possess the character of an eternal verity. The combination of social forces through which it came into existence as a political right may also be the very instrumentalities of its destruction. However, to perceive the forces whereby it came into existence should enable the Christian Church to build its spiritual defenses against its eventual destruction.

Religious liberty then is a legal right to worship God or not to worship God under the political organization of society. Within the frame of a political system the individual's conscience is the sole sanction for his conduct. No governmental power and no ecclesiastical censorship can infringe this liberty under any pretense of authority without thereby immediately denying its sanctity. Not even divine authority has delegated to any social group or to any political organization the legal right to impose restraint upon the freedom of conscience, but has reserved solely unto itself the exclusive jurisdiction of passing judgment. And yet the very idea of 'religious liberty' in its modern social aspects predicates a prior condition of restraint and coercion in the matter of conscience and religion.

Inasmuch as the Christian religion is a religion of the spirit, and it is in the spirit and not in the outer law of the social order that its work had to be done, it should be readily understandable that it is not concerned with initiating and creating social systems

and institutions for the physical improvement of mankind. On the contrary, the evils and injustices in the social system are not inherent therein because of the system as such. They are embedded in the very nature and perversity of man who creates the social system and any correction or amelioration of the condition can be obviated only by a basic change in that nature. Yet, in the Protestant world the charismatic character of the Christian religion as the source of its beneficial power in society has gradually been relinquished under the influence of theological liberalism and the distorted ideal of an economic democracy. It is being assumed that religious liberty is a vested, inalienable right, vouchsafed unto every man by virtue of his membership in an order permeated with a Christian ethic, rather than by virtue of his membership in a political order. The leaders of Christian thinking rarely become severely conscious of the fact that the origin of the legal right to worship without coercion was a political development and not a religious emancipation. Thus religious liberty cannot be taken for granted in the political sphere. It is a grant and not a superior right in the political organization.

Nevertheless, it is especially imperative when considering the inevitable fluctuations in the social order, where the Church must function and have its being by God's decree, that it be constantly on the alert to discover those tendencies and forces which will involve its attitude and may easily enough divert it from its divine purpose. Not necessarily will its judgment be for the purpose of opposing any change, but definitely it must be for the purpose of evaluating the consequences of any change in relation to its universal, transcendent and divine reason. The implications of the social process may be good or bad, but always there are implications. Hence the Church must know more than that the economic dialectic of communism is anti-God and atheistic. As was the case when the democratic idea of constitutionalism was substituted for the theory of the divine right of kings, communism may slough off its anti-religious elements. Can the Church then recognize Marxian collectivism as a social, political, and economic system in harmony with God's government of society? Is individual property, as expounded by John Locke, in reality the basis of social existence and free government and thus a divine institu-

tion? Or may property be held exclusively by the collective ownership of the State? We are not now seeking an answer to these questions, but the Church must eventually have an answer. It cannot depend on a fortuitous evolution for solution.

Very often from a superficial view of movements and tendencies in the social frame, it may appear to the traditional conservatism of the Church that these are of no immediate concern to it. This was the case with the theory of religious liberty. It was not a spontaneous phenomenon suddenly thrust upon the Church, but it was long implicit in the current, social agitation. The same may be said of the totalitarian concept of the State. This was not an utopian invention of the modern dictators, maliciously framed for the purpose of destroying the Church. The conditions, therefore, tending towards the appearance of detrimental causes operating in the historical process, should actually upon careful analysis have been foreseen, if the inspection were properly directed. In most instances it will be found that the motivating impetus is economic and plays an important, if not the determining, role. Economics constitute the real pressures, while external politics are but the avenues of organized expression. The Marxian dialectic of history is not entirely a fallacy.

Nevertheless, the Christian need make no concessions to the Marxian interpretation of history in recognizing the fact that social change is basically conditioned by an escape from economic pressures. Thus, slavery of human beings, as old and as wide as mankind itself, perished with the advent of the industrial revolution and the machine age, because it was no longer economically profitable in a society of free enterprise. Humanitarian considerations could no more have abolished slavery, than could Christianity, founded on the principle of love. But the Christian does differ radically in his assignment of economic motivations as basic causes for social progress. For him cause and effect are so intimately and inextricably integrated in the social process, that human dialectics are no less frustrated in the attempt to distinguish one from the other, than is the philosopher in answering the conundrum whether the egg or the hen came first. For him there is always a divine destiny in the historical process, in which both cause and effect are equally implicated to accomplish the ultimate

end. And this end is not the Marxian perfection of economic man and the realization of the Kingdom of God on earth by the elimination of the class conflict through a proletarian revolution, but the perfection of mortal man for eternity in time through faith in the Redemption of Christ. That is the theology of history from the Christian point of view.

The Historical Processes Creating Religious Liberty

In order to justify the final conclusions of this essay that religious liberty is a political right, conditioned in the economics of the historical process and by the working out of that process in constant danger of being lost, it is necessary to look for the cause of its emergence and to discover the threats to its continuance. For in the historical process there is no assurance that it will continue. As a rule the reasons for social systems and institutions are not immediately discernible in the contemporary currents of history. Neither is the realization of the ultimate form of an institutional structure directly implicit in the external character of social forces. The ultimate reason for social institutions, as they appear in the process of history, can only be determined by a long range perspective.

The facts of history cannot be isolated as so many atoms in the social order. They operate only in groups as a concatenation, each link forming a part of the social chain of events, yet useless and futile independently of the whole. Until the Crusades the whole economy of life was conditioned by an agrarian perspective supported within the frame of feudalism. And while feudalism was determined to continue as a political institution for several centuries more, its disintegration was inevitably foredoomed in the appearance of two new forces created by the economic consequences of the Crusades: urbanism and commercialism. Trade demanded cities and cities demanded liberty from serfdom and feudal entails. But within the categories of urbanism and commercialism must be sought the roots of religious liberty as a legal principle. Without this preconditioning in the transformation of society the Reformation and the culmination of its consequences would not have been possible in the process of history.

The Dark Ages not all Darkness

The Middle Ages are not as dark in all respects as is sometimes alleged and as Protestants would like to believe. The premises of their conclusions are apt to be conditioned by their theological judgment and predicated too exclusively on the corruptions of the Church. But viewed in historical retrospect much more must be discovered in those medieval centuries than the futile speculations of the scholastics and the bitter contest of the Catholic hierarchy with the constituted political authority. These features were merely the external evidences of intellectual and theological deterioration and represented in reality the beginning of the final death struggle of a decadent religious and social system with the powerful forces destined to purify the Church in head and members and establish the new order of democracy.

But not until the fullness of time had come in the historical process could Luther reform the Church. There had to be imminent in the forces and tendencies appearing in the social order potentialities for a reorientation of secular life as well as a religious reformation. The connotation of the Dark Ages is not merely corruption and stagnation, it is also very definitely social creation. While the religious and social forces were gathering momentum for the final conjuncture and were already evident in the signs of the times, yet neither the Church nor the political powers possessed the perspicacity to foresee and prevent the explosion. Men abandoned the corruptions of the Church and sought refuge in the rationalistic intellectualism of the new learning and dedicated their knowledge, ability and energy to a dynamic, secular economy, which promised them reward and liberation from the bondage of feudal overlordship and from the restraints of an ecclesiastical tyranny.

The new universities no longer offered the glossaries on the canon law nor the dialectics of a defunct scholasticism as the attraction to their thousands of students; but over the objection of the Pope and the ecclesiastical orders they adopted a curriculum of the new learning and offered the revitalized Roman law. With alacrity and enthusiasm the intellectual aspirations and the economic necessities of the commercial world were met. The interests of commerce concentrated on the indispensable economics of bank-

ing, shipping, money and the exchange of the marketplace. The Fuggers of Augsburg, the bankers of Florence, Genoa, and Venice, and the merchants of the Hansa and Amsterdam were little concerned about the glossaries on the canon law and even less about the fantastic speculations of the scholastics in the realm of theology. They resented the financial machinations and schemes of the Papacy to meet its extravagances. The new economic idea was pragmatic, as commerce and capitalism always is, and demanded the certainty of a legal system, universal in its application, to meet the exigencies of the rising economy and trade. Thus the *Reception*, notwithstanding Luther's opposition, was inevitable; and the customary law of the communes, as currently reflected in the *Sachsenspiegel* and similar codes of law transmitted from the days of the barbarian invasion, was destined to oblivion. Medievalism had contributed the universities, the *Reception* of the Roman law, capitalism, and the concept of humanism. Under this constellation of social and legal forces the Reformation and the Modern Age were born.

The Contributions of the Reformation to Religious Liberty

When the great Reformer arrived in the progress of history at the door of the castle chapel with his ninety-five theses, proclaiming the way unto repentance and eternal life by faith and the liberty of the Christian man by virtue of his royal priesthood, the political organization of society in Western Europe was still ruled by the constitution of feudalism; and the villein was still the chattel of his lord. And notwithstanding the article of the Augsburg Confession on civil affairs, the Reformation accepted the political and ecclesiastical structure of centuries, that the Church and State were one functional organization and that the Holy Roman Empire and the *Respublica Christiana* constituted an undifferentiated mass of humanity. But no matter what the external attitude of the Reformation may have been, it could not escape the new rationale of society and the forces of secularization.

Hence Luther shortly found his Reformation confronted with a substantial revolution, notwithstanding his conception that it was entirely a matter of the spiritual man. The peasant could not comprehend that the liberty of the Christian should not embrace

his political liberty and freedom from economic subjugation. The feudal lords could not conceive of any freedom apart from their political and economic rights, which would not violate the accepted sanctity of intimate union of the Church and the government of society. Yet, out of this conflict through the travail of future centuries the idea of religious liberty was to be born, when the full impact of Luther's emphasis on the individual in relation to salvation was actually transferred to the political and economic area of life and became the functional basis of modern society.

But whatever the contributions of the Middle Ages may have been as a providential precondition to the Reformation, these were in fact only concerned in the social power. They were not concerned in the first place with man as man who in the image of his Creator and by divine foreordination was destined to be the center of the universe, but whose ultimate destiny was beyond the process of history and time. The thinking of humanism in its social implications had not progressed beyond the Aristotelean conception that man is 'a political animal' and finds the highest expression of his personality in association. It remained for Luther to discover the total man, although he saw him immediately only in his relationship to God and the Redemption; not the good and perfect man, but the sinful man, who is individually predestined to salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. The accomplishment and perfection of this salvation must, however, take place in the social order, where the Church moves and has its being.

Had Luther contributed nothing more to the ideology of the Reformation than a correct conception of the individual man in his relation to time and eternity, there can be little doubt that in its final consequences modern civilization would have emerged, substantially in its present form bottomed on that individual man. But unfortunately, the Church of the Reformation, whether Lutheran or Calvinist, could not understand and appreciate the magnitude of this contribution in all its social ramifications and especially its significance for the liberty of the Christian man and the Church in the social order.

The Church became the victim of its time and environment, forfeited its organizational independence and adopted subserviently

as its own cause the political ambitions of dynastic nationalism and the economic pressures of mercantilism. For in the last analysis the intense and bitter struggle of the wars of religion in the centuries following the Reformation was but the rationalization of political and economic contests for the aggrandizement of the national state. Real as they may have appeared in the cost of blood, the religious aspects were only an incident; the actual substance of the conflict was not the establishment of one religious ideality in preference to another through the power of the State. Religion served only as the handy medium through which the economic and political issues could be channelled and made concrete to human intelligence. For then as now, wars needed an emotional delusion to justify the sinful irrationality of man, who refused to read in his association the immorality of the group in action, which he would have repudiated as an individual.

Rationalism Assumes Control of the Social Process

But again unfortunately, exhausted from the shedding of blood in a cause not its own, the organized Church compromised its divine and universal purpose to proclaim salvation to sinful man. It accepted uncritically and supported vehemently the political theory of the divine right of kings in the formula of *cuius regio eius religio* and thought it was serving God. That the Church should become entangled in unholy alliances with the political and economic theories and movements of the age, has always been its misfortune and distraction; but also it demonstrates clearly the imperative demand to maintain its organizational independence and to be in the world, but to avoid the moral urge to be of the world. It must judge the world and, therefore, it should demand its jurisdictional independence and right to religious liberty. But having eyes, it failed to see, and heaving ears, it failed to hear.

In spite of the growing opposition from the rationalistic conception of the State and the organization of society by consent for its economic existence, the body of the Church maintained its traditional interest and insisted upon its alliance with the social order of things, fearful of any change or progress. In the process of the secularization and individualization of society and the

definite domination of the idea of the national State as a political and economic unity, the ecclesiastical leaders and interests continued to insist on the parallel interests of Church and State. These could not apprehend that neither politics nor economics were the paramount interests of the Church. In the view of rationalism the incongruous interests of the Church with those of the State necessarily represented a disruptive force which had to be excised from the body politic. Again, only under a different aspect, the age-old conflict between Church and State was being renewed. Luther's contribution of the individual man to the social ideology appeared to be in serious danger. But rationalism was destined to win the day. Not by its own logic, but by the adoption of Locke's idea that the right of the individual under the law of the State was paramount. Society was on the verge of the industrial revolution and the political rights of man, and the Church over its opposition was about to win the blessing of religious liberty.

It is not proposed to pursue at this time all the ramifications and influences of rationalism through which the separation of Church and State and religious liberty were finally achieved. This course would take us too far afield. It can only be stated at this point in the discussion that rationalism itself was not the product of a pure intellectualism, but the reaction to definite social conditions. When the Churches continued to insist on the compulsion of the law to make men holy, as the basis of their right and purpose in the political order, instead of the persuasion of Christian love, reason rejected the contention and sought a rational principle for the peace and welfare of mankind in the material interests of life and in the secular institutions of society. Men in their natural pride and confusion turned to their own political and social creation and glorified the creature more than God. The State became the idol and the economic beneficiaries became its chanting priesthood. The natural law was rationalized as the highest expression of a norm for man's moral conduct and by this conception of the natural law all men were considered equal before God and the law. Thus equality was exemplified in Locke's idea of life, liberty, and property. For the preservation of these men assembled to form governments by the consent of the gov-

erned and imposed the obligation upon it to protect the rights, derived from the state of nature.

After much controversy and two English revolutions, costing one king his head and the other his throne, John Locke finally succeeded in synthesizing the various conflicting theories of the inception of government and the structural organization of society. "Men being," he said, "by nature free, equal and independent, no one can be put out of this estate and subjected to the political power of another without his own consent, which is done by agreeing with other men, to join and unite into a community for their comfortable, safe, and peaceable living, one amongst another, in a secure enjoyment of their property."¹ But the purpose of this government is entirely economic and for the protection of the individual's property. He says: "The great and chief end, therefore, of men uniting into commonwealths, and putting themselves under government, is the preservation of their property; to which in the state of nature there are many things wanting."² And finally the man having given up his right in the state of nature by consent with other men, this commonwealth must be regulated by the laws to which consent has been given, and which laws are "promulgated and known to the people."

True, Locke's concept of property includes life and liberty, yet for him life, liberty, and property are vouchsafed by the law of nature to every man in the state of nature and for the preservation of these government has been organized. Freedom of worship has no implication of a natural right and was therefore not taken into the obligations of the State. The worship of God is a means to eternal salvation and as such lies entirely without the sphere of the State. The Church is "a voluntary society of men joining themselves together of their own accord in order to do the public worshipping of God in such manner as they judge acceptable to Him, and effectual to the salvation of their souls."³ The care of souls is thus removed from the jurisdiction of the State, because it is concerned only with the material and not the eternal.

1) John Locke, *Of Civil Government* (Everybody's Library), p. 164.

2) *Ibid.*, p. 180.

Of course, it is not intended to assert that Locke was the first to hold that the interests of religion and politics were not parallel, in fact, were mutually exclusive spheres in the social order. John Milton and Roger Williams and many others, even the Jesuits in France, before them had expressed similar views, depending upon which religious view happened to be in the minority. But he was the first recognized philosopher in the area of political science who succeeded in formulating a rational philosophy of government in his work 'Of Civil Government' and in his 'Letters on Toleration' in which were defined precisely the proper fields of operation for the State and the Church. In fact, he excluded the Church from any participation in the secular affairs of the government and freed the government from any obligation to the Church. Religion thus became a matter of the individual conscience and conviction and denied to secular authority any probing of the conscience or doctrine. Religion was strictly a relationship of man to God.

To Locke must be given the credit that in the course of the next century the actual separation of Church and State became a political reality, whether viewed jurisdictionally as in the case of Prussia under Frederick the Great or by actual separation as provided in the constitution of the United States. It was his theory of the law of nature, of the rights of the individual, and of the extent of the power of the sovereign State, which inaugurated and gave a philosophic foundation to the Age of Reason and Enlightenment in the realm of politics and economics. As Luther considered the rights and duties of the Christian man in the area of religion, so Locke considered this individual in the political area, where his rights were paramount and the supreme obligation of the government was to protect those rights, based on the idea of life, liberty and property. The care and salvation of souls does not fall within these categories.

In the commercial atmosphere of England the doctrine of individual rights found congenial soil and received its modern, pragmatic connotation, which eventually constituted the ethical basis for the industrial revolution and whose prophet was to be

3) Letter concerning Toleration.

Adam Smith in his 'Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations.' The complete title of this book is significant, as showing the emphasis on the economic aspect of his doctrines, which were to constitute the foundation for the social philosophy of *laissez faire*. Not in England, but in America this philosophy found its ideal execution as well as its concrete exemplification. Here political rights and economic interests were in fact so completely integrated that the basic theory of the constitution must be read in that light to make possible an intelligent interpretation of the document. The first amendment was in reality an afterthought, but intended to bar the influence of the Church in national politics to the disadvantage of the States. It was not initiated for the benefit of the Church, but for the protection of the State.

A Divine Blessing Conferred over the Objection of the Church

Thus a divine blessing was conferred over the objection of the Church. However, it was John Locke who became the father of religious liberty in America through the efforts of the ardent disciple, Thomas Jefferson. Protestant apologists love to point to Roger Williams as the real founder of religious liberty in America, but his achievement was not a significant factor in bringing about the separation of Church and State in the United States. Besides, the churchmen themselves had repudiated the doctrine of Williams in the bitter controversy with Jefferson and the latter was reluctant to accept any source whose origin stemmed from religion. Whatever Jefferson's religious convictions may have been, the fact is that he was motivated completely in his advocacy of religious liberty by the rationalistic philosophy of the Age of Reason and the Enlightenment. He had not intended to confer a benefit upon organized religion, as it eventually proved to be. He was determined that political freedom and the economic welfare of the nation must reject the untenable contention that the State owes the Church any financial support and moral cooperation in the proclamation of its doctrines. Each is an independent entity and has its own specific objectives, which cannot be harmonized without imposing coercion upon the individual conscience and denying both political liberty and religious liberty in the interrelationship.

That the organized Churches at the time of the Revolution should have tenaciously insisted on a mutuality of interest and purpose between them and the State and on their right to dictate the moral norm of political policy and conduct, appears wholly unintelligible in the face of one hundred and fifty years of successful experimentation to the contrary. But just as unintelligible does it appear when churchmen again attempt to rehabilitate the position of the Church in the political affairs of the nation. The immediate provocation for the conflict, however, was not the first amendment of the constitution, but the 'Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom.' In the contest Jefferson directed his whole argument against the position of the Church and for the State, and the leaders of the Church just as vigorously contended to maintain its position in the State. And yet, the separation of Church and State and the constitutional guarantee of religious liberty in America has not persuaded the Churches of the unlimited magnitude of the divine blessing. In fact, it may be seriously questioned whether organized religion has not after all accepted this divine boon with certain rationalized reservations.

Beware of the Greeks Bearing Gifts

At any rate, the conduct of the Church and State justify more than a suspicion, since there is convincing evidence that they are again carrying on between them an unholy *liaison* and refuse to be warned and to read in the history of the past any lesson for the future. The Church seems to be imbued with a certain complex of superiority over its social environment which it assumes will preclude the influence of adverse forces and processes. The revival of its former attitude concerning matters strictly within the sphere of government, is now euphemistically rationalized, in that it asserts the moral obligation to infiltrate a Christian ethic into the thinking of the government. But unfortunately, in violation of the philosophy of Jefferson regarding the actual separation of Church and State, the government too is assuming a beneficent attitude towards the Church in that it is holding out the bait of flattering the Churches, whether Jewish or Christian, that the contribution of the religious group is an imperative to sustain and perpetuate the morale and the morality of dem-

ocracy. In this process the ideal of Luther's individual has been completely submerged in the total group for the benefit of the amorphous mass. But, liberty, whether religious or political, can never survive on the basis of the mass man ideology. There is no mass democracy as there is no mass Redemption. Either situation must deal only with the individual man in relationships.

What then are the signs of the times which proclaim in no uncertain terms: *Caveat Ecclesia*. We must emphasize that our topic is, religious liberty in an *economic* society, and we have endeavored to demonstrate that economic pressures in contrast to idealism are the real forces in the context of history. That without the economic implications in the social order there would have been no liberty, much less religious liberty. We have also assumed the premises that religious liberty is clearly a divine blessing, conferred for the benefit of Church and State alike. But by analogy with Luther's warning regarding the loss of the Gospel, religious liberty will, too, be lost to the Church through indifference or through the inept interpretation of the historical forces in the social order, because in the very nature of the situation governments are in the first instance responsive to pressures bottomed on the economic welfare of the subject, rather than on religious ideals beyond time. Naturally, we shall not try to interpret the forces operating in the world, but we cannot escape the repercussions at large upon the social life and thought of our own nation, which will reflect in the attitude of the Christian.

As indicated, the concept of the individual man as the pivotal point around whom revolves the entire political process of representative government and of functional democracy, is no longer the exclusive and dominant factor in modern, social philosophy. The social psychology of the world at large has substituted for the political individual the economic mass man and under the influence of the Marxian dialectic the purpose of the State is concentrated upon his welfare. The new man in his social aspects is altogether materialistic in his thinking, the product of his economic environment and the victim of the machine age and the process of mass production. From the moral point of view he is a nonentity. His well-being is predicated exclusively upon the equality of the total, social mass, and that inevitably im-

plies for its realization as the very minimum the socialization of the national, economic resources through the collective control of the State. Indeed, under this totalitarian conception of society the delusion of economic democracy as a substitute and improvement over a political democracy involves of necessity the total denial of the moral and sinful man as the functional object of the Christian Church and the divine plan of Redemption. In this conception there is only a present, never a future.

The secular State as a social institution is concerned only with the material present and is not concerned with the things of eternity and the salvation of the soul. Hence when any concession may have been made to the Church, it is always on condition. If the concession conflicts with the temporal objectives of the State, then it will be nullified or religion must conform its objectives as an adjunct of the State to expedite the temporal policy. For instance, in the case of alleged necessities of total war, no matter how conscientious and politically disinterested a missionary of the enemy nation may have been in pursuing the injunction to preach the Gospel, as the divine and universal command, which is not confined by the fiction of national boundaries, he will, nevertheless, be interned and made a prisoner of war. Indeed, because of its divine call, transcending time and social institutions, the Church of necessity will be unequally yoked together with the State under any view taken of the concessions made. It cannot remain an independent entity when it joins hands with the government in the matter of religion, although the grants may appear to be voluntary. To think otherwise, is merely becoming a victim of its own rationalizations. For the State to encourage this attitude and solicit the co-operation of the churches merely as an organized group for the purpose of its political policies is, indeed, a case of the Greeks bearing gifts with an ulterior purpose.

When pressed to its final consequences, the total State means the complete absorption of the individual person and his submergence as a moral being in the end and purpose of the State. Under the theory of positivism the State is absolute and nothing controls, limits, or evaluates its action. It is a law unto itself and within its jurisdiction all must conform to its self-appointed purpose. The superiority of the natural law and rights of the individual as

a moral being accountable to God is denied. Outside of itself no person or group of persons or a community of interest can be constituted which claims a right of autonomy, but that it will immediately clash head on with the concept of totality. In its very nature it cannot tolerate the idea of dualism in any form, for in so doing, it would have to admit a competitive legal and moral force with the implicit right to question its validity and judge its competence and capacity. This conception excludes the Christian Church as an independent entity and parallel institution, notwithstanding that by God's decree it transcends the political order.

The Economic Signs towards the Total State

The objection is anticipated that this summary conclusion is too pessimistic and not justified by the social facts. Whatever the situation may have been in Germany and Russia, in democratic America the danger to the Church is too remote as to rate even a comment or allusion. But let it be remembered that in the historical process social and political movements and tendencies do not appear instantaneously like the thief in the night without prior warning and announcement. No social institutions are generated *ex nihilo*. There always is a prior cause of which the Church being in the world must take vital cognizance and to which it must apply a divinely directed judgment instead of a rationalized interpretation.

Viewing history in retrospect the Reformation of the Church was definitely foretold, not only by men, but also for centuries in the negative facts of ecclesiastical corruption and decadence: Even more positively in the appearance of the ideological conception of economics as the new way of life. But the Church persisted in its course and would not reform. Furthermore, the total State was not created by the will of any one man. Neither Hitler nor Mussolini nor Stalin decreed the total collectivistic State by the fiat of his will. Their appearance was long foreshadowed in the conjuncture of historical events founded on the economic determinism of Marx, the legal positivism of the power of the State, and finally on the collectivistic doctrine of the economic equality of all men in their social totality, because free enterprise

and the philosophy of *laissez faire* had disappointed the materialistic hopes of men and refused to reform itself.

By a peculiar quirk of the human mind, impressed and dominated by the things of its proximate presence, the Christian no less than the rationalist believes that he is the master of his social environment. And thus under such leadership the Church is apt to rush in where angels fear to tread. To think that this nation is free from the process of collectivization, because of its democratic cliches and the guarantees of the constitution, is a monstrous delusion. This conclusion may be readily verified by a reference to the insidious doctrine of 'adaptable vitality'⁴ lately infiltrated into the interpretation of the constitution. True, the ultimate consummation of the process may be deferred, but to deny it still involves a positive misinterpretation of the political power under economic pressure which demands the unity of the total State. No matter what concessions then the State may seem to make voluntarily to the Church, these must always be compatible with its ultimate purpose, conceived within the frame of its economic policy.

What then are specifically the economic signs in America, which should forewarn the thinking and the judgment of the churchmen, before they commit the Church to the policy of the government and accept grants without any reservation? And I will say at this point that this is not a matter of obedience and subjection to the power of the State. It pertains to the functional purpose of the Church over which the government of the State can have no right of dictation, except that it be willing to violate the concept of religious liberty.

Probably the greatest menace to the freedom of conscience in the governmental process, and, therefore, to the free operation of the Church, is the present political theory that the primary function of the State must be the economic welfare of the total mass of citizens. This economic function is in the process of superseding the Lockean idea that the protection of political rights of the individual under the law is the paramount obligation of government. In itself the idea of economic welfare might be

⁴) *Murdock vs. Commonwealth of Penn.* 63 U. S. Sup. Ct. Rep. 870.

acceptable as the policy and reason of the State. But the ethical basis of this conception involves an abuse of power by the government, because it injects into the idea of justice the connotation of economic equality. The Christian can accept no such interpretation of justice, because it has its origin in the righteousness of God and hence implies inequality. If the validity of the economic connotation is accepted, then the moral man is excluded and in his place has been substituted the undifferentiated mass man. Extend the logic of the welfare concept to its ultimate limits and inevitably you arrive at the total State. How soon, is shrouded in the historical mystery of the future. Furthermore, within the category of welfare must be embraced social security, unemployment compensation, social medicine, the now acute housing problem and education, to mention but a few of the things which connote economic welfare; and the end is not yet.

Before leaving the topic of economic signs, it is necessary to advert to the great threatening sign in the social horizon on which is written in flaring letters for all who run to read: LABOR vs. CAPITAL. We are not directly concerned in this connection with the justice or injustice of the demands of one upon the other. That is a subject of its own. What we are interested in, is the motivating philosophy dictating the attitude and conduct of the two conflicting groups and the consequences to religious liberty. Labor has almost universally, and may we say quite uncritically, adopted the Marxian theory of the surplus value of labor in the productive process. Without productive labor, it is argued, there would be no value in capital, now constituting the foundation of Western civilization. Moreover, the surplus value theory is predicated on class production and denies the productivity of the individual. His interest is merged in the category of labor as a mass concept, but the economic interest of the mass is primary and wholly materialistic and subject to no moral inhibitions. In those areas where this connotation has become the dominant factor, the legal philosophy and legislative policy are definitely reflected in the action and attitude of the State. Labor departments of the State, for instance, now propose to the Churches chaplains of labor. Not, however, to save souls, but to harmonize conflicting social and economic interests of the group. The Church cannot

accept the elimination of the individual and remain true to its divine purpose, unless it is ready to adopt unequivocally the social gospel approach.

Capital, in the modern aspect of the corporative institution, has become altogether impersonal and thereby amoral. As a famous English judge has said, 'the corporation has no soul.' Through the magnitude of its ramifications, the divorcement of management and ownership is imperative and its operation is thus reduced to a problem of mere administrative function. Speed, mass production, and the machine owe no moral obligation to the man. In a sense they are mere social abstractions and only economic forces. Hence social security, unemployment compensation, and old age benefits are placed under the control and execution of a legal entity, called the State, which must substitute for moral responsibility and personal ownership. Any objective evaluation of the relationship of capital and labor in the social order posits the inevitable conclusion that the control and co-ordination of these two opposing institutions cannot for long rest on the theory of free enterprise and competition and the bargaining power of labor on a contractual basis for participation in the profits of industry .

The writer is not looking backwards and advocating a return to *laissez faire* without a full realization of its economic sins and ruthless egotism. But is the Church aware of the fact that the corporative structure implies economic totalitarianism? The advocates of planned economy have always contended that the modern corporative entity is but the prototype of the socialized State. And it seems to be a law of social dynamics that once the death sentence has been pronounced upon a social and political system and its institutions, there is no reprieve to avert the execution of the sentence in the social process. There can be no doubt that the world is living in the midst of a social revolution; and again, there can be no doubt that this revolution will have its repercussions in the ideology of the Christian Church which must function in the revolutionary world.

The Church in the Economic Constellation

The democratic process definitely implies freedom of expression and organization and this means critical factions, political

parties, and eventually compromise in establishing the policy of the government. In a large measure such a condition revolves around economic issues, as the history of political parties and the division of sentiment in the nation convincingly demonstrates. But the very opposite phenomena of the totalitarian drift are the consolidation of parties in the one party system and the forcible unification of thought. Toleration of any other condition violates the totalitarian conception and the sovereignty of the government and would be considered a disruptive element in the unity of the State. And this nation under the pressures of economic necessity is gradually, and we would like to think unconsciously, falling into a similar attitude. Political factiousness and party dissension, in particular under the exigencies of war, are frowned on as disruptive of national unity and power and in the case of foreign relations unity of policy has already come to be an official imperative. But the inhibition of freedom through such a social philosophy will in the end seriously imperil democracy and freedom of the individual.

In the struggle for power the Church has not escaped the impact of this social psychology. While it may believe itself to be immune in the aggregate group to any such trivial mundane influence, it cannot in the long run escape the psychological reactions of its members and leaders, exposed to the infectious, social ideology of their environment. The general movements and tendencies to consolidate various Protestant denominational bodies including the Lutheran branch, whether by amalgamation, federation, or unification of doctrine, does not in the first instance have its initiative in the ideals of Christian brotherhood and a desire for unity of the faith. It is a reflection of the social and political climate, in which the membership and leadership move, and is an urge in the religious area for unification, patterned after political tendencies and economic efficiency. This striving is a theoretical rationalization that through this external union of Christian forces the Church will be better enabled to accomplish its divine purpose without senseless duplication of effort and costs and it thinks to be serving God thereby in the social order. Doctrine and religious unity are not material factors in the compromise.

Under the former democratic conception of freedom, where every man or group of men were entitled to their own opinion

and ideal for the sake of conscience, separatism in the Church was a no more serious cause for emotional offense than in the realm of politics. Only as political and economic imperatives denounced factions and parties as disruptive in the body politic and as impairing the national economy, did ecclesiastical economy adopt a like attitude toward denominational factions. The urge, and it is significant, has had its repercussions in governmental circles, in that the religious world in America has now been divided into Protestant, Lutheran, Catholic, and Jew. In any objective consideration of the situation it is wholly futile for the Lutheran Church to believe that this division can be maintained. Unity and sovereignty are basic attributes of the State and it will not for long submit to any division of authority even in the field of religion, especially when religion itself is demanding elimination of denominational distinctions. Will the Lutheran Church then enter the political arena, as other churches have, to claim a dubious, political concession and frustrate the blessings of religious liberty? The State is not interested in saving souls for eternity and it must not through any pretense of authority or concession maintain its morale through the organized Church. Or will the Lutheran Church compromise its independent position, as history proves that organized Churches always have, in exchange for a temporal, political advantage? The rationalization, that it must serve its members on the way to heaven with the true Lutheran doctrine, is a fiction; or that it offers an opportunity to preach the Gospel is a price far too high to pay in exchange for its independence in the social order.

The Lutheran Church cannot afford to venture into the economic maelstrom of statism and assume by reason of its orthodoxy that it will remain immune to the pressures and ideologies of its association. It is an axiom of the historical process, in the considered judgment of the writer, that group conduct whether in the political or religious area cannot in any aspect under the auspices of power and compulsion retain freedom of thought and action. No matter, how innocent or how great the concessions appear to be as in the case of chaplaincies in the armed forces of the nation, the right of the power and prescription by the State in the placement, payment, and direction must trench upon the

call of Gospel liberty in the Church. And this loss of freedom cannot be compensated by any rationalization of opportunity or liberation from economic obligations.

In conclusion let us say again: *Caveat Ecclesia Lutherana*. Retain religious liberty in every aspect of an economic society. Read the history of religious liberty and the signs of the social process in their ultimate consequences to a free Church. Although both are instituted of God, State and Church in their end and purpose cannot have intimate and integrated association, because one operates only in time for time; the other has its operation in time but its end is eternity.

EUGENE WENGERT.

THE MASORETIC TEXT AND THE TEXT OF THE NEWLY DISCOVERED ISAIAH MANUSCRIPT

One of the first and most important questions which the remarkable discovery of the Isaiah manuscript of the second century B. C. raises in our minds is not one pertaining to the discovery as such,¹⁾ but one pertaining to the Masoretic text of our Hebrew Bibles: How does the text of our *Biblia Hebraica*²⁾ compare with the text of this newly discovered manuscript? Everyone who reads and studies the Isaiah text of his *Biblia Hebraica* and who uses the critical apparatus with its *Qere*, its variants, and its versional readings will have a desire to compare the Masoretic and the Manuscript text with one another, knowing that the manuscripts of our Masoretic text are comparatively late, hardly any earlier than A. D. 900. Added to this the *Kethib* of the Masoretic text does not always agree with the reading of the other manuscripts, while the Masoretes often suggested other readings (*Qere*) than those of the *Kethib*. Finally the oldest versions, the *Septuagint* and the *Peshitto*, offer renderings that often suggest a

¹⁾ Our readers have been informed of this discovery in the 1948 issue of the *Quartalschrift*, in both the April (p. 150) and the July number (p. 213f.).

²⁾ We are referring to the *Biblia Hebraica*, edited by Rud. Kittel, which in its third edition (1937) is generally known as the Kittel-Kahle Bible.

different textual reading of the manuscripts of the translators. In view of these divergencies we greatly welcome the newly discovered Isaiah manuscript of the second century before Christ. We welcome it, because we want to compare the text of our *Biblia Hebraica* with it. There are even a definite number of passages which each one of us has found in his Hebrew Bible, which we very much desire to compare with the reading of an older text than that of our *Biblia Hebraica*. Either the texts of the passages which we have in mind may be corrupt, although the other manuscripts offer no alternative reading, or they are not supported by the other manuscripts, whose texts have a different reading, or the oldest translations of the Versions presuppose a different reading of the text. Who does not think of chapter 9 verse 3 in our Christmas Epistle which reads according to the King James Version: "Thou hast multiplied the nation, and not increased the joy"? Luther has: *Du machest der Heiden viel, damit machest du der Freuden nicht viel*. These two translations are in accord with the *Kethib* of our *Biblia Hebraica*. But according to the reading of about twenty other manuscripts and according to the *Qere*, there is no negative, no *lo'*, in the sentence at all. Instead of the *lo'* these manuscripts have *lô*, the preposition *l'* with the suffix of the third person. The whole sentence then reads: "Thou makest the nation numerous, and preparest for it great joy." Now there are those commentators (Hengstenberg, Hitzig, Schegg, Stoeckhardt a. o.) who have argued in favor of the negative conjunction *lo'*, whatever their specific translation of the sentence may be; others again (Lowth, Delitzsch a. o.) have followed the reading of the *Qere*; still others have changed the *haggoi lo'* into *haggilah*, thereby creating a perfect parallelism, and translate: "Thou hast multiplied the rejoicing, thou hast made great the joy." ³⁾ In view of these three probable readings we certainly

³⁾ Gray, Isaiah in *The International Critical Commentary*, p. 164. Professor Pieper in the 1921 issue of the *Quartalschrift* also favors this change and argues: „Damit haben wir nicht nur den schönsten Sinn in den beiden Sätzen, sondern auch einen bei Jesaias sehr häufigen Parallelismus: Jubel und Freude. . . . Was diese Textkorrektur so stark empfiehlt, ist die Tatsache, dass auch in den nächsten beiden Sätzen, die diese ersten beiden nach Jesaianischer Art entwickeln, die beiden Begriffe Jubel und Freude, und zwar in umgekehrter Ordnung (Chiasmus), in the Verben gerade so wiederkehren. . . . Auf keinen Fall bringt diese Korrektur einen falschen oder auch nur einen unpassenden Gedanken in den Text; sie bleibt genau im Zusammenhang" (pp. 7f.).

are anxious to know what wording the newly discovered Isaiah manuscript has.

Or what Old Testament scholar has not the desire to find out whether verse 9 in chapter 53 with its *w'eth 'ashir b'mothairw*, translated by our Authorized Version: "and with the rich in his death," is a corrupt reading or not. Professor Pieper remarks in his Isaiah Commentary: *Will man also den Text nicht ändern, so heisst b'mothajw in seinem Todeszustand und nichts andres* (p. 411). But if one with Cheyne does change the Masoretic reading, one again has the following fine parallelism: "And his grave was appointed with the rebellious, and with the wicked his tomb," having changed 'ashir into 'osê ra' and b'moth into bâmātho. How grateful would we be to see the reading of this Messianic passage cleared up by the authority of a much older textual reading.

There are, of course, other passages in our Masoretic Isaiah text which we would like to compare with our second century Manuscript text. We are, for instance, seeking an answer to the question whether in 48, 11 the questionable reading *khi êkh yēhal*, translated by our Authorized Version according to the Septuagint "for how should my name be polluted," is a gloss. Professor Pieper deems it possible stating: *Darum ist es möglich, dass der Satz ursprünglich eine Randbemerkung gewesen ist, die man dann in den Text aufgenommen hat* (p. 286). Or do we find in this verse a corruption of the Masoretic text and did the Septuagint with its *hoti to emon onoma bebēloutai* reproduce the reading of the original text? The same question may be asked in regard to verse 3 of chapter 47 which, with its *w'lo' 'ephga' 'adam*, has always been a crux of the translators. Our Authorized Version following the Septuagint has translated: "And I will not meet thee as a man." Luther in following the Vulgate translated: *Ich will mich rächen, und soll mir's kein Mensch abbitten*. But Codex A of the Septuagint read 'amar instead of 'adam, which has led many translators, also Alex R. Gordon in *An American Translation*, to read as one phrase the last word of verse 3, namely 'amar, and the first word of verse 4, namely *go'alēnu*, and to translate: "Says our Redeemer." In joining *w'lo' 'ephga'* to the words preceding it in sentence 3, we have the reading: "For vengeance

inexorable will I take, says our Redeemer." Concerning the emendation of 'amar for 'adam Professor Pieper rightly says: *Letztere Emendation ist wirklich bestechend denn sie gibt nicht nur einen passenden Sinn, sondern stellt auch zwei vollkommene Qinahzeilen her* (p. 261). We may add that as long as an emendation is supported by a variant reading in one or the other Hebrew manuscript or in one of the ancient Versions, there is always some justification for such an emendation. Professor Pieper is therefore justified in saying of the emendation mentioned above: *Nur der genannte LXX-Codex gibt der Sache hier eine gewisse Berechtigung* (p. 262). But in the case of mere conjectures on the part of scholars we are usually averse to depart from the reading of the Masoretic text. And even if the conjecture is very plausible and enticing, we will sing Professor Pieper's refrain: *Wenn man nur Gewissheit hätte* (pp. 111, 199, 576 a. o.). This certainty we want to gain by studying this oldest Isaiah manuscript, in as far as this manuscript can give us certainty. No manuscript written by a copyist is perfect. Everyone has its errors, its omissions and additions, characteristic of the errors of any and every copyist. Only the original text as it proceeded from the hand or the dictation of the inspired writer was without error.

In view of the above mentioned passages it is regrettable that the newly discovered manuscript has not yet been published, so that we could compare the reading of the Masoretic Text with that of the Isaiah Manuscript. We owe it to the *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, however, that we at present and at this comparatively early date know in part how our Masoretic text compares with the text of this oldest manuscript. Millar Burrows, President of the American Schools of Oriental Research, has done the spade work in comparing our Masoretic text with this second century text and has made the following observation concerning the newly discovered manuscript: "Differing notably in orthography and somewhat in morphology, it agrees with the Masoretic text to a remarkable degree in wording. Herein lies its chief importance, supporting the fidelity of the Masoretic tradition."⁴)

⁴) Cf. the article, Variant Readings in the Isaiah Manuscript, in the October, 1948 issue (number 111) of the *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* (pp. 16ff.).

This statement, although it is a very welcome one, is also a very general one. For as soon as we get down to a comparison of words and phrases we will find many differences. These differences, let us say that at once, may detract more from the authenticity of our Manuscript text than from our Masoretic text. Despite its old age, our Manuscript text cannot always claim to have preserved the original reading. On the contrary, by comparing it with our well-preserved Masoretic text it becomes quite evident that the scribe of our Manuscript text has quite often succumbed to the common errors and oversights of a copyist. In the *Bulletin* these errors are listed according to certain categories. First of all we have many omissions of words and phrases and in one case even an omission of a whole sentence. These omissions should not take us too much by surprise, since, as Dr. Burrows points out, they are "minor omissions, but nothing comparable with those found in the Septuagint of some of the books of the Old Testament" (p. 17). In order to be able to give our readers an idea of the nature of some of these omissions, we will list a few of them as they have been compiled in the *Bulletin*.

While our Masoretic text has passages in which certain words are repeated once and twice and these repetitions find their support in their respective contexts, the scribe of our Manuscript text has often failed to record these repetitions. Dr. Burrows therefore concludes that these "omissions may have been made deliberately by a scribe who did not have the modern scholar's concern for meter" (p. 17). Such omissions are to be found in Isaiah 6, 2, 3, where *qādôsh* is only repeated once; in 8, 9; 38, 11; 57, 19; and 62, 10. The reader by studying the Masoretic text of Isaiah with its repetitions will be able to gain an idea of the significance of the omissions of the Manuscript text for the structure of the verses in question. Other omissions are those that pertain to "other words or brief groups of words," or, as in 2, 9 and 10, to a whole sentence (10) and part of the foregoing sentence (9). As one of the reasons for such omissions Dr. Burrows mentions the possibility that "the space was left blank in order to fill in later words missing or illegible in the scribe's copy" (p. 17). Another reason is that the scribe's eye jumped from one word to the other that was similar to it or a repetition of it thereby omitting,

as in one case (16, 8f.), no less than twenty words ranging between the proper name *Sibmah* in 8 and *Sibmah* in 9. This omission and two others in 4, 5 and 23, 15 Dr. Burrows designates as "three clear instances of homoioteleuton."

But just as the scribe omitted words he also added some. About forty such additions are listed in the *Bulletin*, some brief, some of greater length. These additions are also designated as "non-omissions, if the text of the Ms. is correct." Still most of these are regarded by Dr. Burrows as "scribal errors of familiar types that have caused the departures of our Ms. from the tradition preserved in the M. T." There are, for instance, clear cases of dittography, of additions produced under the influence of words in a preceding verse, of additions inserted "for the sense," or also of additions, as in chapters 36-39, that may have been produced by the "more or less conscious association with the text of 2 Kings."

Finally, we have instances in our Manuscript text, where a single letter is omitted. Dr. Burrows quotes, among others, two passages (37, 13 and 37, 26), in which the letter *He* is omitted and adds: "There are other indications that our Ms. or one of its prototypes was written from dictation by a reader who did not pronounce the *He* strongly." If this was the case, we can more readily understand why our scribe became guilty of some of the other omissions.

Our readers, however, should not get the impression from the foregoing that our Isaiah Manuscript, where it differs from the Masoretic text, is always in error. A Hebrew manuscript of the second pre-Christian century will certainly contain many readings which will serve to correct the reading of our Masoretic text, wherever that has not already been done by the *Qere* of the Masoretes.

Such passages in Isaiah are first of all those that can be compared with parallel passages of some other book of the Old Testament. Thus the four chapters in Isaiah 36-39 have a parallel text in 2 Kings 18, 19, and 20. Delitzsch claims that the text in the Book of Kings is the better and more authentic. Now, whenever 2 Kings and our Manuscript text agree against the Masoretic text of Isaiah, it is probable that the latter has a corrupt

reading of the original. These instances are, however, "heavily overburdened," Dr. Burrows tells us, "by the many points in which 2 Kings agrees with the Masoretic text of Isaiah as against our Manuscript text." Still where the opposite is true, we should not forego the possibility of correcting our Masoretic text. The variants, which appear in such parallel passages, may not be of great importance to the average reader of the Hebrew text. The textual critic, however, who studies every variant on its own merits, thinks differently, and rightly so. The reader, if he has the desire, can look up the variants wherein Kings and the Manuscript text agree against the Masoretic text in Isaiah. He can do this quite well with the help of the critical apparatus in the Kittel Bible. The passages that have these variants are the following: 2 Kings 18, 20, 22 agrees with the Manuscript text of Isaiah against the Masoretic text of Isaiah 36, 5, 7; 2 Kings 19, 19 agrees with the Manuscript text against the Masoretic text of Isaiah 37, 20; 2 Kings 20, 6 agrees with the Manuscript text against the Masoretic text of Isaiah 38, 6; and 2 Kings 20, 13 agrees with the Manuscript text against the Masoretic text of Isaiah 39, 2. Certainly, these agreements or differences only pertain to the number and person of a verb, or to the additions or omissions of a word. Only in one of the cases listed does our Manuscript text together with Kings have four additional words which are missing in the Masoretic text of Isaiah (38, 6). Whether such words are omissions in the Masoretic text or additions in the Manuscript text is, of course, a question to which, at present, there is no final answer.

Again, readings are found in our Manuscript text which agree with those of other manuscripts against the Masoretic text. At these points the omission or addition of only a single letter again goes to make up the difference between the Manuscript text and the Masoretic text. Still the points of difference are often of no little importance to the commentator. The well-known verse 18 of chapter 1 is such a case in point. It is in this verse, if anywhere, that we want to know the original reading word for word. The critical apparatus, however, shows us that four manuscripts differ with the Masoretic text as to one important word in this sentence. While only a single letter is involved in this difference,

nevertheless the omission or addition of this letter gives the word in question quite a change of meaning. We are referring to the word *shanîm* in our Masoretic text, which is translated by the Authorized Version with "scarlet," by Luther with *blutrot*. But both Versions have not followed the Masoretic reading, let alone that Luther with his *blutrot* has even changed the figure of speech. Stoeckhardt in his translation of this verse gives an exact rendering of the Masoretic reading: *Wenn eure Sünden wie Scharlachzeug sind (Jesaia, p. 10)*. Delitzsch does likewise: "If your sins come out like scarlet clothes" (p. 80). Indeed, the *shanîm* are clothes which have been dyed with *shanî*, a bright red color, drawn from the coloring matter called *thola'at shanî*, a worm dye, the color *coccineus*, the crimson obtained from the *coccus*-insect. *Karmesin* is the foreign word used in German. This color is the point of comparison in both parts of our sentence and the four manuscripts referred to in the critical apparatus have everything in their favor with the reading *shanî* instead of *shanîm*, as found in the Masoretic text. The oldest Versions rendered translations for *shanî* and not for *shanîm* and our German and English Versions followed their lead. Support for this reading and translation is now found in the Manuscript text of the second century.

Thirdly there are readings found in our Manuscript text which agree with the *Qere* of the Masoretes and some of the Versions. In chapter 49, verse 5, the Masoretic text has the negative *lo'*, while the Manuscript text has *lô*, i. e., the preposition *l'* with the suffix of the third person singular. Professor Pieper chose this *lô* on the basis of the *Qere*. This reading now has the full support of the oldest manuscript. Why did not Dr. Burrows in this connection look up Isaiah 9, 2 in the newly discovered manuscript and inform us, if it has *lô* also instead of the negative *lo'* of the Masoretic text? As regards *tsophaw* in 56, 10 Professor Pieper already stated: *Zophaw soll natürlich, wie das Q're anmerkt, zophajw heissen* (p. 470). The Vulgate, the Authorized Version, Luther's translation, and most commentators follow the *Qere* and translate "his watchmen." The Septuagint has a different reading as far as the vocalization of the word is concerned, translating it as an imperative form: *Idete*. Our Manuscript text, however, agrees with the *Qere* and reads *tsophaiw*, thus adding

greatly to the authenticity of this reading and to the translation: *His watchmen*. In regard to a questionable reading in 65, 4 Professor Pieper states: *P'raq = Gebrochenes, Gebröck, oder m'raq, wie das Q're will, = Brühe*" (p. 637). Here we have two altogether different words and not only two variant forms of the same word. One of them can only have been the original. Our Manuscript text has *m'raq*, a proof, as we may add, that the *Qere* readings were not always, or perhaps even in the fewest of instances, conjectures on the part of the Masoretes, but were the readings of other manuscripts.

Fourthly our Manuscript text contains many readings which are in agreement with the Septuagint and other Versions against the Masoretic text. Here we encounter some interesting cases. In 45, 2, for instance, we find the *hapax legomenon hadurim*, which is translated by our Authorized Version "crooked places," a meaning which the word has, as Volz points out in his *Jesaias II* (p. 59), in the Hebrew of the Talmud. Therefore the reading *hadurim* should not, according to his opinion, be replaced by the better known word *hārim* or by any other, for that matter. Still the *Septuagint* must have read *hārim*, since it uses *orē* in its translation. Now our Manuscript text has *harārim*, hills, and we must translate: "I will make the hills straight," an expression which conforms to that of 40, 4: "Every mountain and hill shall be made low." A still more interesting example is 49, 24 with its *Kethib* reading *tsaddiq* and its *Qere* reading *'arits*. Is *tsaddiq* the original reading of our text and if so, what does *tsaddiq* mean? Our Authorized Version has translated it as adjective: "Shall the prey be taken from the mighty or the lawful (*tsaddiq*) captive delivered?" Luther translated it as a noun: *Kann man auch einem Riesen den Raub nehmen? Oder kann man dem Gerechten (tsaddiq) seine Gefangenen los machen?* Delitzsch has retained this meaning of *tsaddiq* regarding it as an "exegetical genitive" and translating: "Can booty be actually wrested from a hero, or will the captive crowd of righteous ones (*tsaddiq*) escape?" Professor Pieper has also retained the reading *tsaddiq*, but has given it a different rendering on the basis of the etymology of the word. His translation reads: *Kann auch dem Starken wohl der Raub geraubt, und die Gefang'nenschar dem Sieger ab-*

benommen werden? *Tsaddiq* can indeed have the meaning of *Sieger, siegrich* (cf. Volz, *Jesaia* II, p. 99) and this meaning is a very fitting one corresponding well to *gibbor, Starken*, in the first part of this parallelism. Still the question remains whether *tsaddiq* or *'arits*, tyrant, is the original reading. This latter meaning corresponds still better to *gibbor*, mighty one, which can also be translated with tyrant (cf. Ps. 52, 3, A. V., verse 1). It should also be noted that *'arits* is used in the very next verse of our chapter, in verse 25, which is the answer to the question in verse 24. And then the Syriac Version and the Vulgate (a robusto) read *'arits*. To this we can now add that our Manuscript text also has *'arits*. Indeed, *'arits* has much convincing evidence in its favor.

These are instances which show us how the Manuscript text supports the Versions against the Masoretic text. But it has already been stated that there are also a great many points at which the Manuscript text supports the Masoretic text against the Versions. Only a few instances are noted in the *Bulletin*, but one of them is of special import to us. We are referring to verse 17 in chapter 38, which is very well known to the reader of Luther's inimitable translation of this verse: *Siehe, um Trost war mir sehr bange; du aber hast dich meiner Seele herzlich angenommen, dass sie nicht verdürbe, denn du wirfst alle meine Sünde hinter dich zurück.* In comparing this translation with the *Septuagint* and the *Vulgate* we see that Luther followed these two Versions in translating as he did. But their translation presupposes a different reading from that of the Masoretic text as to one word. The *heilou* of the *Septuagint* and the *erusti* of the *Vulgate* presuppose the Hebrew word *ḥasakh*, to hold, withhold, to deliver, while the Masoretes have *ḥasaq*, to hold or bind together, to be attached to, to love. The English reader will readily notice that the Authorized Version has used both words putting the translation for *ḥasakh* into italics: *delivered it*. Delitzsch has translated the whole sentence literally: "And thou, thou hast loved my soul out of the pit of destruction," *i. e.*, thou hast allured it, drawn it alluringly out of the pit of destruction. *Ḥasaq* is indeed a more significant word, as Delitzsch puts it, one to be preferred to *ḥasakh*, to deliver the soul out of the pit of destruction. And

our Manuscript text has this significant word *hasaq*, to be attached to, to love. This fact does not detract from Luther's translation, for the expression: *Du hast dich meiner herzlich angenommen* also has, in the word *herzlich*, the concept of love. Only we must keep in mind that Luther derived his translation *angenommen* not from *hasaq* but from the word *hasakh*, which, as our Authorized Version indicates, is not in the Masoretic text, and as we now also know, not in the oldest Manuscript text of Isaiah.

Other examples could be taken from the *Bulletin* as illustrations for the agreements and differences between the Masoretic and the Manuscript text. Still these may suffice for the time being. We only hope that one of the following articles by Dr. Burrows will compare those passages which we quoted in the beginning of this article and which, to our great disappointment, were not to be found among the passages listed in the October issue of the *Bulletin*. For we, above all, desire to compare Isaiah 9, 3 and 53, 9 with the Manuscript text. This can only be done at present by those who have access to the manuscript. Since the manuscript has been found in "such a perfect state of preservation" and since it contains "the complete text" of Isaiah with but the exception of "a few small lacunae," we have every assurance that the above mentioned passages will also be found in the text of the newly discovered manuscript and published in due time. Again, since this Isaiah manuscript "contains in its fifty-four columns of Hebrew writing the complete text of that important Biblical book," we now also know that it contains all the chapters of Second Isaiah, a fact which proves that in the second century B. C. First and Second Isaiah were published as one continuous writing.⁵⁾

P. PETERS.

5) Our issue of the *Bulletin* informs us in an article on the "Jerusalem Scrolls" that "there is no indentation for a new paragraph, though the end of chapter 39 on the line leaves a space of about eight letters at the end, indicating that a paragraph closes there." The author of the article, John C. Trever, adds that "a special study of the paragraphing . . . is necessary before any further conclusions can be reached" (pp. 9f.). We are also informed that "chapters are not indicated, but a paragraphing system is used. . . . In most cases paragraphs begin at the margin when the previous line is not full. There are also numerous examples where a new paragraph is indented, but that is usually where the previous lines is full. There seems to be no logical consistency in the

NEWS AND COMMENTS

The Tide of Union. In its December issue the *Lutheran Outlook* brings a report of the biennial convention of the American Lutheran Conference held in Detroit November 10-12. This article stresses a report of the Commission on Lutheran Church Unity which reviews the action taken by various Lutheran bodies with regard to union with each other. The section which deals with the resolutions of the American Lutheran Church is introduced by the information that this body, meeting early in October, rejected the first recommendations of its floor committee because they were not regarded as sufficiently strong. Then follows the text of the resolution which was finally adopted and which we bring here because it shows the overall picture.

"Whereas, We are committed to the ultimate unity of all Lutherans in America as God's will for us, and

"Whereas, We are hopeful that much progress can be made in the immediate future toward realization of this ideal, in view of the fact that several bodies, namely, the United Lutheran Church in America, the Evangelical Lutheran Church, the Augustana Lutheran Church, the United Evangelical Lutheran Church, have recently adopted resolutions looking toward closer affiliations with other Lutheran synods; and the Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod, at its 1947 convention voted the reappointment of a Committee on Doctrinal Unity to continue negotiations with our Committee on Fellowship, and

"Whereas, We are desirous to make our full contribution to the attainment of Lutheran unity, therefore be it

"Resolved,

"1. That we reaffirm our position on 'Selective Fellowship,' (cf. *Minutes*, 1946, Appleton, Wis.) expressing our gratitude and joy over the measure of fellowship that has already been attained with respect to both the United Lutheran Church in America and the Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod.

"2. That we pledge our vigorous co-operation in the expanding program of activity of the National Lutheran Council, looking to the day when all Lutheran church bodies will hold membership in the National Lutheran Council.

method of spacing." In regard to the whole matter of a First and Second Isaiah it must be kept in mind that our Isaiah manuscript "is later than the canonization of the book and would not be expected to show any variation" from manuscripts of the Christian era. None of the portions of Second Isaiah including those of a Third Isaiah have been dated by the critics much later than 350 B. C. Only a few chapters of the third portion, chapters 56-66, have been dated by some critics as late as 200 B. C. These critics, of course, have been shown to be mistaken.

"3. That we continue a Committee on Fellowship to be appointed by the president of the Church to negotiate with a Committee on Doctrinal Unity of the Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod, toward the establishment of pulpit and altar fellowship or of fellowship commensurate with the existing degree of unity.

"4. That this committee together with the Executive Committee of the Church be instructed to explore the possibilities of merger with interested bodies within the American Lutheran Conference and report its progress at the next meeting of the Church.

"5. That we empower this committee together with the Executive Committee of the Church to receive and consider resolutions which may emanate from the United Lutheran Church in America now in convention assembled at Philadelphia and to discuss with any and all Lutheran church bodies possible approaches and methods to attain a fuller unity and closer affiliation."

From the foregoing it is clear that the tides of union are still running strong; that the American Lutheran Church is not receding in any degree from its position on Selective Fellowship; that it is strengthening its ties with its sister synods in the American Lutheran Conference without any visible attempts to bring these bodies around to the new position which, as a result of its negotiations with Missouri, it once professed to occupy; that its relations with the United Lutheran Church are closer than ever before.

It should be equally clear that if our sister synod does not wish to leave itself open to misinterpretation of its intentions in continuing its own negotiations with the A. L. C., it must make it unmistakably clear that by this trend the A. L. C. is nullifying whatever progress it may once have made in the direction of conservative Lutheranism. If Missouri were not to speak plainly at this time, it would be tantamount to accepting the parity status which the A. L. C. report assigns to it. Such a step, in fact, is made doubly necessary by the statement of the National Lutheran Editors' Association to which we referred in our last issue (p. 270). It should not be difficult to decide on a clear cut course of action. A plain word spoken at this time will work wonders to clear the atmosphere. We are waiting.

E. REIM.

Dean Madson and the Lutheran Outlook. From the editorial section of the *Lutheran Outlook*, September, 1948, we take the following:

* * * *

"*Pseudo-Lutherans?* If the Religious News Service is correct in its information, that was a surprisingly wild attack that was made on nearly all the rest of the Lutherans of America and of the world by a speaker at the Milwaukee meeting of the Synodical Conference. The speaker was Prof.

Norman Madson of Bethany Theological Seminary, Mankato, Minnesota. Dr. Madson is reported to have urged the delegates to the Conference to maintain purity of doctrine and to 'seek the old ways' in their doctrinal interpretations.

"So far, so good. Most Lutherans would subscribe to that, especially if it were put in New Testament language, that we should 'earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints.' But Dr. Madson accompanied his call for conservative firmness in doctrine with an intemperate name-calling that included just about all Lutherans except those of the Synodical Conference. 'Pseudo-Lutherans,' he called them, 'who seek to unite with all who call themselves Lutherans.' Whom did he mean? Well, he specifically mentioned the 'so-called' Lutheran World Federation that met at Lund, Sweden, last year. He said that these 'unionist' Lutherans could 'reach a point of ecclesiastical hysteria' in their attempts to promote Lutheran cooperation.

"As to taking part in the Amsterdam assembly to set up a World Council of Churches, Dr. Madson warned that 'these Lund theologians are making their way toward a day of clerical confusion which dawns this month in Amsterdam.'

"Quoting the famous Romans 16 pasage: 'Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned,' the speaker declared: 'This is our answer to those who say the Missouri Synod is afflicted with narrow legalism and isolationism. Would you call us guilty of narrow legalism when we do not associate with those whom we have been told to avoid?'

"It is of such utterances, I suppose, that Shakespeare said they 'cannot but make the judicious grieve.'

"In the first place, I do not understand how Dr. Madson can speak for the Missouri Synod. Teaching at the Mankato Seminary, he presumably is a member of the small Norwegian Synod which is in affiliation with Missouri in the Synodical Conference. But I know that there are numbers of Missouri Synod pastors and professors who would not agree with his interpretation of Romans 16:17 as including all Lutherans except those of one's own particular group. To bring them under the apostle's condemnation is to class them with heretics and enemies of the cross of Christ.

"Then to call all others 'Pseudo' (that is, false) Lutherans, and to speak of an honest attempt to think together and work together as a 'so-called' Lutheran World Federation, and to say of these other Lutherans that they are capable of reaching a point of 'ecclesiastical hysteria' — this is hardly the language of temperance and moderation which one would expect to hear in a meeting of the Synodical Conference. Does not the Missouri Synod — which is the largest part of the Synodical Conference — also 'seek to unite with all who call themselves Lutherans'? Have

they not had their representatives in Europe, making contacts, bringing material and spiritual aid to brethren in distress? Does that make them also 'Pseudo-Lutherans'?

"In regard to taking part in the Amsterdam World Council, there has been some honest hesitation on the part of some American Lutheran church bodies. Those who decided to participate did not do so with any idea of surrendering historic Christian doctrines in a 'peace at any price' movement. They did so rather with the idea of strengthening the voice of conservative Christianity at Amsterdam. To prophesy that they 'are making their way toward a day of clerical confusion which dawns this month in Amsterdam' is therefore both unkind and unwise. Ought not the heirs of sound doctrine to appear at a place and time like that to bear witness and raise their voice for the faith once delivered to the saints? Is it better and more Christian to stay in Mankato, Minn., or Milwaukee, Wis., and condemn everyone who goes to Amsterdam? To me it sounds like one man in a marching army saying, 'You are all out of step but me'."

So far the *Outlook*.

* * * *

The foregoing sharp criticism makes it clear that the editor of the *Outlook* was more than a little annoyed by the report of Dean Madson's sermon. This we can understand, for the preacher's way of saying these things is admittedly severe. The real test, however, is what a man says, rather than how he says it. In order to enable our readers to form their own judgment we are bringing the text of Dean Madson's sermon in the first section of this issue, without comment.

For the editor of the *Outlook* we have but one suggestion. He seems particularly irked by Prof. Madson's use of the term "Pseudo-Lutherans" in referring to those whom he sees as departing from "the old ways." If the Editor will consult the December issue of the *Outlook* he will find that one of his own contributors has used the obnoxious term no less than four times in the course of his very interesting article on "Distinctive Characteristics of American Lutheran and Scandinavian Lutheran Theology." And *he* calls those theologians "Pseudo-Lutherans" who defend the plenary inspiration of the Bible!

We hope that we will be forgiven for suggesting that the *Outlook* look out.

E. REIM.

Veterans of Foreign Wars. Under this heading the *Lutheran Witness* of October 19, 1948, brought an official release by the Bureau of Information on Secret Orders, Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod, which very likely surprised the brethren of our Wisconsin Synod who read it, and may even have caused them considerable worry and concern. Since

the members of our faculty are in part responsible for the information on the Veterans of Foreign Wars contained in the pamphlet entitled "Veterans' Organizations Examined in the Light of Scripture," published in 1947 for the members of our Synod, we consider it our duty to reprint here the release of our sister synod and to add some comments on it. The release reads as follows:

Synod's Bureau of Information on Secret Orders is pleased to release the following information regarding the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

In a letter dated June 19, 1947, Mr. R. B. Handy, Jr., Quartermaster General of the V. F. W. with headquarters in Kansas City, Mo., informed the undersigned that "Section 110 of the By-Laws places emphasis upon *election* to membership rather than oral obligation." He goes on to say, "The membership obligation on the application card is to be signed by the applicant and is considered sufficient obligation if he is elected to membership," accordingly "a newly elected member may . . . avoid the full initiatory ceremony." Then Mr. Handy adds the significant comment, "The trend is away from ritualism, and many of our posts dispense with the initiation ceremony or use only a brief form which includes little but the membership obligation."

It is evident from Mr. Handy's communication that applicants may now be elected to membership in the VFW if they have merely signed the application card. Initiation is no longer obligatory. In view of Mr. Handy's communication, Synod's Bureau of Information on Secret Orders is of the opinion that veterans belonging to our congregations can now join the VFW without violating their conscience. The caution is of course in order that Christians will at all times and in all places bear witness to the faith that is in them and will never condone what is sinful in the sight of God. — PAUL M. BRETSCHER, BUREAU OF INFORMATION ON SECRET ORDERS.

That this release constitutes a reversal of the stand formerly taken by the Bureau of Information is evident from the words, "can *now* join the VFW without violating their conscience." This can only mean that previously the Bureau advised the veterans of its synod *not* to join the VFW because thereby they *would* violate their conscience. This previous stand completely agreed with the findings of our Committee as expressed in the Summary on page fourteen of our tract: "What has been stated, should suffice to convince any Christian within our Synod that a Lutheran veteran could not join this organization without becoming disloyal to his Savior and unfaithful to the Word of Salvation revealed in the Holy Scriptures."

It is, therefore, clearly important to determine what was formerly considered offensive in the VFW by the two synods and why the

Bureau of the Missouri Synod no longer believes those offensive features to exist.

Let us examine the Report On Veterans' Organizations published in tract form by the Bureau in 1945. On page fourteen of this Report we read that efforts were made by representatives of the Bureau for several years and as late as 1944 "to induce them (the national officers of the organization) to make the ritual optional." Evidently the ritual, then, was considered offensive by the Bureau. This is stated in so many words on page nine: "The ritual . . . has a strong religious flavor. It contains prayers by the chaplain and a complete burial service. In these prayers there is no reference to Jesus Christ. . . . The burial service contains a number of references to eternal life and exhortations to the survivors to live a life which will make them worthy (!) to enter it."

From these statements regarding the ritual we are justified in concluding that our sister synod previously considered it a violation of a Lutheran veterans' conscience if by becoming a member of the VFW he submitted to the contents of the ritual. Herein we were also in full agreement with the sister synod. On page ten of our pamphlet we stated: "What has thus far been said about the Ritual will have convinced every Christian veteran that it is unacceptable. He will not want to have any part of it."

At this point, then, the question arises, what has changed in regard to the ritual to justify the statement in the Release, that veterans can now join the VFW without violating their conscience? Has this offensive manual been abolished by the VFW? Or have all its unacceptable features been stricken? Nothing to that effect is claimed in the Release, and from our own correspondence with the officials of the VFW we have valid reason to assume that this is out of the question. The ritual remains a vital feature of the organization.

What, then, has changed in respect to the ritual? Have our veterans been offered a special dispensation, which allows them to become members of the VFW, but which at the same time permits them expressly to repudiate the ritual, and which assures them that they will never be compelled to take part in any of the religious acts prescribed by the ritual? We find nothing in the Release which might warrant such an assumption. How then could we venture to assure a Lutheran veteran that he can now join the VFW without violating his conscience? Or does one not violate his conscience if on the one hand he fervently prays: Lead us not into temptation, but if on the other hand he joins an organization in which, because of its religious ritual, he must expect to be tempted to deny his faith?

On what, then, does the Release base this complete reversal of its advice formerly given to Lutheran veterans regarding membership in the VFW? A very offensive practice in the VFW are the promiscuous prayers offered at meetings of local posts. Concerning these we read the following

in the Bureau's Report of 1945 already referred to: "In dealing with a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, it will certainly make a difference whether he belongs to a post which practices promiscuous prayer and whether he takes part in that or whether he belongs to a post which has dropped this feature. In the one case it is easy to show that he is violating the express command of Scripture. *In the second case he must be shown that his Order insists on a practice which is contrary to Scripture, even if the local does not conform to that practice.* In the first case one would probably refuse Communion to the man. In the second case the individual pastor might bear with the man for a time at least" (p. 11-12; the italic is ours). This can be truly called a significant statement. It is evident that the Bureau considered this matter of promiscuous prayer a very grave issue in connection with membership in the organization. We agreed with that viewpoint wholeheartedly and are particularly pleased with the view expressed in the italic sentence. A Lutheran pastor, writing to Mr. Handy of his objection to these promiscuous prayers, received this enlightening reply: "It seems too bad that any group that voices its desire for divine guidance so that its members may live lives of stainless integrity (sic!) should have to abandon these reverent petitions even though they are actually only recitations (sic!) in a ritualistic ceremony. I believe your church adheres to the Christian faith and that Trinitarianism is one of your tenets. You may be interested to know that all reference to Christ or the Trinity was eliminated to meet objections raised by non-Christians. It seems too bad that we should be asked to adopt a Godless as well as a Christless ritual." In view of this frank but utterly iniquitous statement we were moved to say in our tract: "No further proof should be necessary to convince a true disciple of Christ that there is no room for him in the VFW."

Thus again we were in complete harmony with our sister synod when it previously pointed to promiscuous prayer in the VFW as a barrier to our Lutheran veterans. And now we ask, Is it this objectionable feature, perhaps, which the VFW had promised the Bureau of Information to abolish, thus causing the sister synod to reverse its judgment regarding this organization? Again we are compelled to state that nothing in the Release hints at such a change in the policy of the VFW.

What, then, is the justification for the new stand officially promulgated by our sister synod? To our surprise it is based merely on this communication from Mr. Handy that "Section 110 of the By-Laws places emphasis upon election to membership rather than oral obligation. The membership obligation on the application card is to be signed by the applicant and is considered sufficient obligation if he is elected to membership," accordingly "a newly elected member may . . . avoid the full initiatory ceremony."

In other words, if we read the verb "may" in its most favorable connotation as meaning "he can, if he wishes," and not as meaning, "he may, perhaps," the generous concession of Mr. Handy consists in this that a

Lutheran veteran can become a member of the organization without being initiated by way of the blasphemous ceremony prescribed by the ritual, by simply signing the application card.

One is inclined to grant for a moment that a gratifying result has been achieved. And yet, is the point gained actually so satisfactory that in view of it our veterans can be assured they are no longer violating their conscience if they use the proposed method of acquiring membership? We note that "*the membership obligation* on the application card is to be signed by the applicant." To what is our veteran obligated by his signature? We do not know, since the Release gives no information regarding the Obligation. What we do know is that the Bureau in its Report of 1945 mentions an Obligation which appears to have all the earmarks of the Obligation: referred to in the Release, and to this former Obligation the Bureau firmly objects. Since the Release bases its new policy altogether on the assurance that the signing of this Obligation is innocuous and hence offers an acceptable method of becoming a member of the VFW, we deem it necessary to reprint for our readers what the Report of 1945 has to say on page ten about that earlier Obligation.

In the *Constitution and By-Laws* there is a provision which our Bureau hoped would make it possible for veterans belonging to our churches to affiliate with the VFW without obligating themselves to the religious element in the ritual. This provision refers to an obligation which, if signed by the veteran, makes him an active member of the organization and which seems offhand to take the men out of any identification with the ritual. *However, the obligation which the applicant is to sign is one to which we must object.* (Our emphasis.) The obligation reads:

In the presence of Almighty God, I do, of my own free will and accord, solemnly promise and declare that: I will bear true allegiance to the government of the United States of America, and I will always be loyal thereto, and will never bear arms, nor in any way use my influence against its Laws or Institutions.

I will comply with the Constitution, By-Laws, and Rituals of this Order; and I will always be loyal thereto; that I will never wrong nor defraud this Organization, nor a member thereof, nor permit any wrong to be done to either, if in my power to prevent it. I will never propose for membership any person not eligible according to our Constitution, nor one whom I know to be unworthy.

I will never make known to anyone not authorized to receive it any of the work of this Order, secret or written. Should my affiliation with the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States cease, in any way, I will consider this pledge

as binding outside the Order as though I had remained a member of the same. All this I promise and pledge upon the honor of a true Comrade and a citizen of our great republic.

From the excerpt it is evident that the Bureau objects to the use of this Obligation on the part of our veterans. We are strongly tempted to reprint also the summary of the Bureau's objection to this Obligation as it was rendered by a member of the Bureau, but the above quotation may suffice. And here again we must emphatically state that our own tract reprints this very same Obligation and that our judgment concerning it agrees with the judgment of the Bureau.

But now we ask, is it not reasonable to assume that this Obligation is identical with the one referred to in the Release? For both are said to be found in the By-Laws. Over a period of years requests addressed to the officials of the organization for changes in policy had been met with adamant refusal. Are we to suppose that the body granted a change as great as this to be made in a section of its By-Laws regarding this Obligation?

Granted that this was the case, and that Mr. Handy had furnished the Bureau with the revised form of the Obligation, would it not again be reasonable to assume that the Bureau would have announced this change in its Release, in order to avoid confusing the members of its synod who were acquainted with the grave objectionable character of the Obligation described in the Report of 1945?

One is therefore compelled to put one of two constructions on the Release. If it bases its new opinion on a new purged edition of the Obligation in the By-Laws, then it owed the Church a statement to that effect together with the complete wording of the new Obligation in its Release. If on the other hand this Obligation is identical with the one described by the Bureau in its Report of 1945, then it seems that the Bureau stands condemned by its own judgment as set forth in the Report of 1945. In this connection it should also be pointed out that the Bureau has revised its previous stand in another matter without giving a reason for it. We have in mind the statement quoted from the Report and underscored by us which holds a man who joins the VFW responsible for a practice adopted by the Order which is contrary to Scripture. As of today, however, a Lutheran veteran is told that he can now join the VFW without violating his conscience merely by evading the wicked initiation ceremony. Yet the Order to which he then belongs upholds this ceremony which is contrary to Scripture.

This Release, therefore, permits a Lutheran veteran to hold membership in the VFW, an organization which was hitherto declared to be objectionable on Scriptural grounds, and it bases its new opinion on one solitary premise, the validity of which has been shown to be extremely questionable, to say the least.

But what of the other equally objectionable features which according to the Report were to deter a Lutheran from joining this organization? What about the promiscuous prayers spoken at meetings of the posts, those intentionally Christless prayers, concerning which the Bureau went so far as to say in 1945, that a Lutheran participating in them might probably be refused Holy Communion? What about the Ritual, which was roundly denounced in 1945, and rightly so? Why does the new Release simply ignore these features now? Are Lutherans no longer to be troubled in their conscience about these practices of the VFW?

Or did the Bureau believe that these barriers had been removed by the statement of Mr. Handy, that "the trend is away from ritualism"? This is in no sense a promise that promiscuous prayers are a thing of the past, and that the use of the Ritual need no longer be feared by our members who join the VFW. As a matter of fact, we know from sad experience that even if headquarters had given this promise, our veterans would be wise not to put any stock in it. As is well known to many of our readers, members of one of our own congregations in Wisconsin who belonged to the American Legion protested against the use of prayers at meetings of their local post. Not only did the post refuse to heed the protest, but the state headquarters also made the public statement that they knew nothing of the option said to have been granted by the national body upon which the Lutheran members based their protest. Moreover, these conscientious Lutherans were held up to ridicule and scorn by the leading metropolitan newspapers in the State.

In view of all this we are indeed greatly alarmed and seriously disturbed by the Release of the Bureau of Information and feel in conscience bound to register our objection to it. The Bureau has undertaken to set up a new policy for the Lutheran veterans of its Synod, a policy which rests on a precarious basis, which ignores other features of the VFW formerly declared to be barriers to membership for Lutherans according to Scripture, and which therefore threatens to become a serious peril to the faith and life of Lutherans, not only of the Missouri Synod, but also of the other synods in the Synodical Conference. We hold that brotherly consideration for our Synod should have caused the Bureau of Information to withhold such a Release until they had thoroughly discussed this grave issue with us, for we should know from past experience how seriously the peace and harmony in the church can be damaged if two sister synods follow diametrically opposed courses of action in regard to burning issues in matters of conscience.

It is our sincere hope that the authors of the Release can be persuaded so to modify and to condition the Release in a future number of the *Witness*, that their brethren in the Synodical Conference, who became seriously involved by the Release, may hope for a brotherly discussion on this matter, a return to the policy formerly held by the sister synod and a renewed unanimity of counsel within the sister synods in regard to the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

A. SCHALLER.

The Status of Lutheranism in Germany. Under the heading "The Problem of Lutheran Survival" (*Lutheran Witness*, December 14, 1948) Dr. Theo. Graebner draws a heartrending picture of the terrible losses suffered by the various Lutheran Churches of Central Europe and the Baltic States. Quoting recently published information and statistics he shows the tremendous damage done by the triple blows of Nazism with its policy toward the Church, by the War, and by the Russian invasion. The picture is one of stark tragedy. He closes by quoting an appeal for help: "Europe is in the stage of artificial respiration. Into her famished, broken body fresh plasma must flow in the form of generous gifts from abroad, and into her broken spirit there must continually be transfusions of good will . . ." The *Witness* adds: "Such a 'transfusion of good will' were the sessions at Bad Boll." We find ourselves in agreement with all but the last remark.

In the following issue (December 28) the same writer presents an extremely optimistic account of the spiritual life and vigor manifested by the German Church and its theologians in general, but particularly also in connection with the Bad Boll conferences. The article quotes Bishop Meiser's statement that "Unionism is giving way to the confessional principle." It touches on the problem which arises when in the newly organized Evangelical Church of Germany (EKD, of which Bishop Meiser's newly organized United Lutheran Church of Germany, VELKD, is a major sector) members of Reformed congregations claim the right of communing at Lutheran altars, and vice versa. It seems to imply, however, that the danger of unionism (which certainly seems to be in the making right then and there) has been neutralized by the defeat of Pastor Niemoeller's proposal "that Open Communion between Lutheran and Reformed congregations be introduced." The reader will note that this refers only to *open* communion between *congregations!* But the *Witness* insists on its optimistic appraisal of the entire situation. It says: "The voices occasionally heard which predict the downfall of Lutheranism in Germany, if they do not actually assert that the last stages of decay are even now in progress, were known to us before visiting Germany, and we have heard them since. Such judgments are generalizations on isolated local or territorial conditions. A cross section of German Lutheranism such as we had at Bad Boll supplies no evidence of such a confessional decline."

All this is in sharp contrast to the tone as well as the substance of Dr. Herman Sasse's article in the October number of our *Quartalschrift* (p. 233ff.). One might say that this article actually inverts the above mentioned statement of Bishop Meiser. The Bishop declares that unionism is giving way to confessionalism. Dr. Sasse undertakes to show that confessionalism is giving way to unionism. And to us, at least, he seems to have the better of the argument. The Bishop points to the formation of a Lutheran alliance in the VELKD and sees it as a bulwark of Lutheranism, adequately safeguarding its confessional principle within the

larger organization of EKD. Dr. Sasse considers this a futile defense because of the subordinate status of this Lutheran *Bund* and its complete lack of authority in its dealings with the parent body. In spite of their posthumous declarations to the contrary, Dr. Sasse maintains that in becoming members of the EKD the Lutheran *Landeskirchen* have consented to the completion of the program of the original Prussian Union, have waived their Lutheran status, and actually surrendered their Lutheran character. The tragedy of this situation is underscored by the dramatic heading of Dr. Sasse's article: *Das Ende der lutherischen Landeskirchen Deutschlands*.

In the face of such conflicting reports it is surely not easy to decide who may be right. Dr. Graebner writes on the basis of his personal observations made at Bad Boll. Bishop Meiser speaks with the substantial authority of his official position. But surely, the careful analysis of Dr. Sasse may not be dismissed as "generalizations on isolated local or territorial conditions." His knowledge of conditions in Germany is encyclopedic. He has long been one of the acknowledged leaders of conservative Lutheranism. He has been in the thick of the *Kirchenkampf* for years. His was one of the first voices raised against the peril of the religious politics of Nazism. He has only recently shown the courage of his convictions by severing his connections with the Bavarian Church for conscience' sake and joining the Breslau-Saxon Free Church group. And yet we must certainly grant that he might nevertheless be mistaken in his judgment and misguided in his zeal.

There are, however, certain clearly established facts by which we may gauge the situation with considerable certainty. In our *Quartalschrift* of January, 1948, we reported an article by Dr. Hans Asmussen, Editor of the *Amtsblatt der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland* and one of the Directors of EKD. In this article the intentions of this newly organized church are clearly expressed, namely that no one is to be excluded from Communion in a congregation of the EKD which happens to have a different confession than the congregation to which the communicant belongs (p. 62). A binding theological colloquy is to be held on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper (*ibid.*). A "new understanding of the Words of Institution" is given favorable mention (p. 63). So much for the intentions.

Another article (*Quartalschrift*, October, 1948, 290ff.) tells "What Happened at Eisenach." It quotes a significant paragraph from the constitution that was there adopted: "Called servants of the Word are also not to be prevented from preaching the Word in those congregations that have a different confession, which, however, are still within the framework of all the regulations pertaining to the constituent church-bodies" (p. 291). On communion the following was written into the constitution: "In no constituent church-body is a member of any other recognized confession within the EKD prevented from communing, wherever pastoral responsibility and congregational circumstances demand admission to Communion" (p. 292).

This should be enough to convince any Synodical Conference Lutheran that the EKD is unionistic in its intentions and in principle. And Dr. Sasse's conclusions seem to be fully vindicated.

It is a deplorable thing that the *Witness* has lent the weight of its support to the pro-EKD policies of Bishop Meiser. But it is even more serious that the same Missouri which financed and arranged the Bad Boll Seminars also extended a *de facto* recognition of fellowship by having leaders of various State Churches, including Churches of the Union (*Unierte Kirchen*), serve as spokesmen at its devotions and even in the pulpit. We fear that this has done much to nullify the conservative testimony which undoubtedly was there given by Missouri's representatives. For on the one hand this was certainly a painful disavowal of the stand which the Free Churches of Germany have been taking for a century and more, when they bore the stigma of separatism simply because for conscience' sake they could not worship with the churches which had consented to the Union. On the other hand Missouri, which might have exerted its influence against the participation of at least the more conservative *Landeskirchen* in the union of EKD, must now bear the responsibility for tacitly strengthening the hands of those who but a few weeks later at Eisenach committed their churches to membership in the new Union. That is the reason why we can not consider Bad Boll a wholesome and salutary "transfusion of good will."

Such steps may improve the numerical position of a church, but not the strength of its testimony. It seems strange that last summer it should have remained for — of all people — the Reformed Karl Barth to tell the Lutherans at Amsterdam that the strength of the Church does not lie in numbers: "What objections could we really make if it should please God to carry His work onward and reach His goal, not through a numerical increase but through a drastic numerical decrease of so-called Christendom? It seems to me the only question in this matter is: how can we free ourselves from all quantitative thinking, all statistics, all calculation of observable consequences, all efforts to achieve a Christian world order, and then shape our witness into a witness to the sovereignty of God's mercy, by which alone we can live — a witness to which the Holy Ghost will surely not refuse His confirmation?"

Let Lutherans heed this!

E. REIM.

"The Theological Declaration of Barmen in the Light of the Lutheran Confession." In order to be able to judge the union consummated at Eisenach by the Land churches of Germany in July of 1948, it goes without saying that it does not suffice to know the mere wording of the Theological Declaration, which the Evangelical Church in Germany (EKD) adopted, but that it is also necessary to examine it in the light of the Scriptures and of our Lutheran Confessions. The articles of this

Declaration were published in translation in the previous number of the *Quartalschrift* under the heading of "The Barmen Declaration" (pp. 296ff.). They are only six in number, are surprisingly short, are introduced by one or two Bible verses, and always close with the rejection of a false doctrine. The question arises whether these articles at all suffice as a basis for a union between the United, the Reformed, and the Lutheran Land churches of Germany. Or to say it more pointedly, how are these articles to be judged when compared with the confessions of the three constituent church-bodies? The representatives of these churches at Barmen had promised to perform the task of comparing them with their own Confessions. But as our informant, Oberkirchenrat Christian Stoll, informs us in *Heft 2* of the *Kirchlich-Theologische Hefte*, dated 1946, this had not yet been done twelve years after the Barmen Synod had adjourned. Whether it has been done since 1946 by the United and the Reformed Land churches, we do not know. Oberkirchenrat Stoll, however, informs us in a lengthy *Anmerkung* to his examination of the Theological Declaration that the *Westphälische Provinzial-Synode*, which convened in Bethel July 16, 1946, adopted an ordination formula for members of the Lutheran, the Reformed, and the United churches, which includes the Barmen Theological Declaration and which practically raises this Confession as an *Unionsbekenntnis* above those of the Reformation period. That the United and Reformed churches in Germany make this Confession their own and let it supersede their older Confessions, does not take us by surprise. Our question is whether it has been accepted as binding by the Evangelical Lutheran churches of Germany.

Oberkirchenrat Stoll of Munich, who has been mentioned in the previous number of the *Quartalschrift* together with Dr. H. Sasse by the Rev. F. Hopf in his article, "What Happened at Eisenach" (p. 290), was requested by the *Bruderrat* of the EKD to interpret and to examine the Theological Declaration of Barmen. He did this in an article entitled *Die Theologische Erklärung von Barmen im Urteil des lutherischen Bekenntnisses*. In an introductory paragraph the author states that the name Evangelical Church is a misnomer in the light of Article VII of the Augsburg Confession which declares that "to the true unity of the Church it is enough to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments." This unity is, however, the author argues, not to be found in the EKD, to which churches of different confessions belong. Consequently, the Barmen Declaration can only voice a part of the truth and cannot even outline and sketch the fulness of the Gospel truth. It also does not point out that there are doctrinal differences between the Evangelical churches, let alone that it declares that these doctrinal differences do not any longer obtain or that they cannot any longer be considered as church-divisive. In another introductory paragraph in view of a comparison of the Barmen Confession with the Augsburg Confession the author asserts that the latter bears testimony to the truth of the Scriptures

and that it therefore must be accepted and acknowledged with a *quia* and not with a *quatenus*.

As to the first article of the Barmen Confession, in which Christ is acknowledged as "the one Word of God which we are to hear" it is evident, we are informed, that this Confession was made in contrast to the false teachings of the German Christians, who acknowledged still other events and powers, forces and truths as God's revelation. But this confession does not suffice, our author continues, to fully meet and gainsay the false teachings of our times. For it does not call attention to the two-fold Word through which God has spoken to us, the Law and the Gospel. The first Article does not speak openly and clearly of the Word of God in the Law, which reveals God's wrath against sin and God's judgment upon all men. Had the Law thus been spoken of, then it would have also been necessary to speak differently of Jesus Christ, namely in agreement with the Holy Scriptures and the Lutheran Confession as of our only Mediator, Savior, and Advocate with God. Therefore this first Article does not, our author asseverates, confer the full comfort of the Biblical and confessional Christology which excludes every Arian and Nestorian heresy. In consequence, it also does not say anything about the Old Testament, which was strongly attacked or at least curtailed by the German Christians.

But even the second Article, we are reminded, does not do justice to the riches and the comfort of the Biblical, Lutheran Christology. Even where Christ is called "God's promise" and "God's powerful claim" it is not made clear how "God's claim" and sanctification are related to one another, what "the ungodly ties of this world" are. For we cannot speak without qualification of "ungodly ties." According to the Ten Commandments and to Luther's Small Catechism the Christian has his station in life. Consequently the relationship between the dominion of Jesus Christ and the realms in which we, according to God's will, must be subject to "the higher powers" limited only by Acts 5, 29, is not made clear. Although the purpose of the second Article is to ward off a wrong claim on the part of God-ordained powers, still there is wanting a clear distinction on the one hand, between the dominion of Jesus Christ and the realm of sin, death and the devil, from which we have been ransomed, and, on the other hand, the dominion of those powers, to whom we are subject according to God's gracious ordinances.

There follows Article III on the Church, what the Church is and what her duties are. By way of comparison the author quotes Article VII of the Augsburg Confession: "The Church is the congregation of saints, in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the Sacraments are rightly administered," and adds: This means, among other things, that the Church must give utterance to and must confess the contents of all parts of the Holy Scriptures that go to make up the substance of her message. From this there follows the necessity of separation from those churches

that do not anymore have the correct interpretation of the Scriptures. Applied to the churches represented at Barmen, it means just this that their confessional differences must be taken into account. And while it is only too true that the Church may not relinquish the substance of her message, she however has, according to Article VII of the Augsburg Confession, the liberty of framing the order of her ritual and ceremonies in such a manner as best to serve her main purpose of preaching Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord of all men. Compared with this our Lutheran Confession the third Article of the Barmen Confession does not define clearly enough the true nature of the Church and does not avoid the impression as if the Church, because of a divine law, were bound to a definite order.

Article IV deals with a very important phase of the Church's activity: The ministerial offices of the Church. It does this in opposition to the *Führerprinzip*, we are told, which was thrust upon the Evangelical Church during the National-Socialistic regime. While the author still grants that this counteracts the claim of a *Führeramnt* which has no place in the Church, and insofar conforms to the Lutheran Confession, still it opens the door to a doctrine of the office of the ministry which finds no support in the Augsburg Confession.

Also in regard to Article V our informant states that it is in accord with the Confession of the Lutheran Church in that it differentiates between the spiritual and civil government. Still it is also the duty of the Church, we are told, to remind both the sovereigns and the subjects of their responsibilities according to God's Word. Therefore it is to be noted that Article V does not speak of obedience toward the government. This omission is to be traced back, our informant assumes, to the unclarity in the second Article in regard to the dominion of Christ and of the powers that be.

No statement in the last Article of the Barmen Confession is questioned by the author. He, however, warns once more to keep well in mind the chief concern of the Lutheran Confession, namely that the Gospel is rightly taught and the Sacraments are rightly administered.

In a summary the author gratefully recognizes the purpose and aim of the Barmen Theological Declaration, namely to lay down under very definite circumstances, and as we may add under very trying circumstances, a "common Christian testimony" against the false doctrines of the German Christians. Such a "common Christian testimony," however, is a constant reminder, Oberkirchenrat Stoll remarks, to examine and to certify our Lutheran Confession. This will help us to realize that the Barmen Confession does not always speak clearly and freely, is therefore apt to be misunderstood, and consequently cannot be regarded as a binding confession of the Lutheran Church. The Lutheran Church, for instance, cannot use it in its rite of ordination or as a new union document to be used as a basis for the Evangelical Church in Germany.

This is the final verdict which Oberkirchenrat Stoll renders in regard to the Theological Declaration of Barmen. It is the conclusion and conviction at which he arrives after subjecting this Confession to a strict scrutiny in the light of the Augsburg Confession. He has reached this decision as a member of the Ev. Lutheran Church of Bavaria. Nevertheless, the Lutheran Church of Bavaria has joined the EKD, thereby making the Barmen Confession its own and binding itself to the decisions passed by the Barmen Bekenntnissynode of 1934. Many other Lutheran churches of Germany have also joined the EKD. Dr. Hermann Sasse in his article, *Das Ende der lutherischen Landeskirchen Deutschlands* in the foregoing number of the *Quartalschrift* has stated the truth: "The Lutheran Church of Germany no longer had the power of making a good profession" (p. 240).

Since we cannot expect the Lutheran Land churches to lay down a good Lutheran confession over against the United and the Reformed churches, we look to the Lutheran Free churches in Germany to do so. And they have not disappointed us. They have taken a clear stand against the EKD.* But in the last analysis we must not look to others but to

* This stand has been taken by four Free churches in Germany in a declaration which closes with the following paragraphs: „Die lutherischen Freikirchen sehen in der Zustimmung der Vertreter der lutherischen Landeskirchen zur EKD, wie überhaupt in dem in diesen Kirchen bisher offenbar gewordenen Willen zur EKD, nicht nur ein gegenwartsbedingtes Jrrren. Sie sind sich vielmehr bewußt, daß sich hier eine lange Entwicklung vollendet, in welcher in immer neuen Wellen bekennnisfremde Mächte durch mancherlei Kanäle: wie die Theologie vieler Lehrstühle, die kirchliche Praxis von Gemeinden und großen kirchlichen Verbänden, auch so manche Entscheidungen der Kirchenleitungen — in diese seit der Reformation der reinen Lehre zugetanen Kirchengebiete einströmten und Kraft und Bewußtsein lutherischer Glaubenshaltung mehr und mehr zerstückten. Außerlich steht noch manches. Das Entscheidende aber: die gewissenmäßige Bindung an den Vollgehalt des Evangeliums, die eine klare Abweisung aller dem lutherischen Bekenntnis widersprechenden Lehre einschließt, ist in dem Augenblick für die Kirche als solche dahin, in welchem die lutherischen Landeskirchen durch ihre Synoden die Entscheidung ihrer Vertreter in Eifenach gutheißten und die ‚Grundordnung‘, wenn auch vielleicht mit gewissen Einschränkungen ratifizierten. Nur einzelne können dann noch diese Bindung festhalten — müssen freilich nun in Widerspruch zu ihren eigenen Kirchen geraten.

„Um so mehr erachten es die lutherischen Freikirchen als ihre Pflicht, aller falschen kirchlichen Einigung abzuzagen, durch welche die in der lutherischen Reformation durch Gottes große Gnade wiederentdeckten Heilswahrheiten und Glaubensgüter aufs neue verdunkelt werden oder gar verloren gehen müssen. Nur eine Kirche, welche auch im Zeitalter ‚ökumenischer Haltung‘ sich den Mut erbittet, mit dem Ja zur rechten Lehre das Nein zu aller falschen Lehre zu verbinden, vermag diese Glaubensgüter dem heutigen Geschlechte und unsern Nachfahren zu erhalten. Dahin unter dem Beistand des Herrn der Kirche zu wirken, sind die lutherischen Freikirchen entschlossen.

ourselves as Lutheran Church in America to ascertain in the light of God's Word what our duties and responsibilities are toward the Evangelical Church in Germany. To mention but one thing, it does not suffice to have others study the Barmen Confession for us, as much as their examination of this Confession may be of theological and historical value to us. We ourselves must compare it most thoroughly with the Scriptures and our Lutheran Confessions and then be guided by the results of our own examination and evaluation of this Confession in our stand toward the Lutheran Church of Germany.

P. PETERS.

REVIEWERS' DESK

Take Up Thy Cross. A book of Lenten sermons and meditation by Arndt L. Halvarson. 122 pages. Price, \$1.50. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis 15, Minnesota.

This little volume contains seven meditations for the Sundays during Lent under the heading, *The Cross is Life*, and also six midweek meditations which are headed, *Come*.

These are some of the chapter headings. For the first group: Life is the Testing; Life is the Walking; Life is the Affirming, etc. For the second group: Come — for Personal Cleansing; Come — to a Safe Place; Come — to Good Fellowship, etc.

A. SCHALLER.

This Is Life Eternal. By E. Clifford Nelson. 140 pages. Price, \$1.75. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis 15, Minnesota.

This is said to be "a Lenten study that brings into sharp focus God's holy Law and His holy Gospel. The reader sees the relation between Mt. Sinai and Mt. Calvary." In a lengthy introduction the author seeks to indicate and describe his method of relating the Decalog to the Passion of our Lord. "In the first place, each of the Ten Commandments has been considered in itself. In the second place, the underlying sense, . . . sometimes called its "spiritual meaning," has been sought out. . . . In the third place, in order to provide the appropriate Lenten atmosphere, each portion of the Decalog has been illustrated by some character or incident drawn from the Passion Story. In the fourth place, I have shown that every man is subject to the Moral Law and is personally responsible for his transgressions of it."

„Am Reformationsfeste 1948.

Evangelisch-lutherische Kirche im früheren Ostpreußen.

Evangelisch-lutherische Freikirche in Sachsen u. a. St.

Selbständige Evangelisch-lutherische Kirche in Hessen und Niedersachsen.

Evangelisch-lutherische Kirche in Baden."

While the sermons are instructive as an interpretation of the Decalog and offer interesting reading, they lack the genuine "Lenten atmosphere," which calls for the contemplation of what our Savior attained for us in His vicarious suffering and death.

A. SCHALLER.

With Him All the Way. By Oscar A. Anderson. 216 pages. Price, \$2.00. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis.

We found this series of Lenten discourses truly enjoyable reading. Nothing pleases us more than a sincere attempt on the part of a preacher to interpret for his flock the contents of a text, and to do this under the apparent urge to magnify the precious Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. A few quotations will show more clearly than any discussion why this book of sermons is worthwhile having.

"Let that little brook which Jesus crossed preach this Gospel lesson to all of us, we who are deserving of the wrath of God, that we have a Savior who decided by the Kidron crossing to die that there might be no condemnation for them that take refuge in Him." Another quotation from the author's sermon on Gethsemane: "God help me not to be so matter-of-fact about this! Let me not look upon that victory in Gethsemane as a time-honored historical fact. Like a warrior comes off the battlefield in blood-spattered garments, so Jesus came out of that fray victorious, with His own blood staining His clothes to show the fury of that struggle. For me He will assume the sins of my life, of my being. For me He will become a curse. For me He will experience injustice, shame and death, that I may have grace and glory and life."

There are, it must be said, statements in certain sermons of which our pastors will not approve, and rightly so. They will wish, as we do, that Pastor Anderson had omitted quotes from Jones, Torrey, Meyer, Tanner, Bell, Farrar, Milton, etc., etc., and had substituted quotes from Scripture, from Lutheran theologians and from Pastor Anderson. They will want to go a bit farther than he in the condemnation of commercialism in the Church. They would not consider it Scriptural to address their flock with the unmodified statement that their audience is composed of believers and hypocrites, that "some of you have given Him your approval, but you don't need Him as your Savior."

While we realize that our pastors will discover these and similar opinions which they cannot share, we are nevertheless certain that they will be pleasantly surprised when they read these offerings of a young preacher who is rounding out his seventh year in the ministry.

A. SCHALLER.

This Is Luther. A Character Study by Ewald M. Plass, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri. 1948. Price, \$5.00.

This is not a biography of Luther, although it contains biographical material. It is a character study of the Reformer. As such it is a very

commendable work. The author does not fail to deal with all those characteristics of Luther's person that engage the attention of every student of the life and writings of this "God-inspired hero of the Reformation": His courage as a fruit of his faith, his sensitive conscience, his sincere modesty, his candor and frankness, his outspokenness and honesty. But even when the author speaks about the vehemence and rudeness of Luther's language, he is no less able to set forth clearly and truthfully the facts involved.

We would, however, be giving our readers a onesided view of this book, if we were only to mention in this review Luther's chief characteristics and the manner in which they are being presented by the author. It cannot be left unsaid that the book also contains valuable discussions of Luther's teachings and of Luther as a teacher, of Luther the preacher and theologian, the scholar and writer. As such Professor Plass lets the Reformer pass in review before us in the light of many well selected quotations from his own writings. At the same time we have opportunity to see Luther coping with problems which confronted him in his lifetime and which also confront us today, for instance problems and questions that pertain to government, to heresy, and to revolt. Of course, Professor Plass only treats these subjects in as far as they reflect Luther's character. Nevertheless, the reader thereby also gains much additional knowledge concerning Luther and many an answer to questions which previously had remained unanswered.

We, therefore, gladly recommend this book to pastors and professors, to teachers and laymen alike, convinced that they will learn to know Luther anew.

P. PETERS.

A Child's Garden of Bible Stories. By Arthur W. Gross. Illustrated by Rod Taenzer. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri. 1948. Price, \$2.60. Sixty stories, twenty-eight from the Old Testament, thirty-two from the New Testament. 156 full-color and black-and-white illustrations. 146 pages.

The market offers many fascinating story books for little children who are not yet able to read or who are just acquiring an initial skill in reading. Christian parents who have witnessed the power of such books upon the thought and imagination of their children have undoubtedly looked for an equally fascinating book of Bible stories. Concerned that the faith implanted in the hearts of their children at Holy Baptism be nourished, they would have them above all else live at an early age with their thoughts, feelings, and imagination in the realm of God's gracious acts and truths of salvation. Just such a book is offered to them in this volume. Faithful to the Biblical truths and facts these Bible stories are written with a style, sentence structure, and vocabulary which make them very clear,

vivid, and interesting for little children. At the same time the text is on every page fused with beautiful illustrations which will captivate the imagination of a little child and aid greatly in impressing the presented facts and truths upon mind, heart, and will.

C. J. L.

The Airwaves Proclaim Christ. Radio messages of the first part of the fourteenth Lutheran Hour. By Walter A. Maier. 297 pages. Price, \$3.00. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri.

Northwestern Lutheran Annual, 1949, issued by request of the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States. Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Price: 50 cents.

Gemeindeblatt Kalender 1949, herausgegeben im Auftrage der Allgemeinen Ev.-Luth. Synode von Wisconsin und anderen Staaten. Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee 8, Wisconsin. Preis 50 Cents.

The Lutheran Annual 1949. Editor: O. A. Dorn; Statistical Editor: Armin Schroeder. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis 18, Missouri. Price: 50 cents.

Amerikanischer Kalender für deutsche Lutheraner auf das Jahr 1949. Literarischer Redakteur: D. J. Müller; Statistischer Redakteur: P. Armin Schröder. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis 18, Missouri. Price: 50 cents.

Quartalschrift

Theological Quarterly

Number 2

April, 1949

Volume 46

LETTERS ADDRESSED TO LUTHERAN PASTORS *

BY PROFESSOR HERMAN SASSE

I

Concerning the Status of the Lutheran Churches in the World

Dear Brethren in the Ministry:

The following lines and the letters which, God willing, are to follow this one, are addressed to Lutheran pastors in totally different churches and nations, in Germany and in the remaining Europe, in North and South America, in Africa and Australia. They are addressed to fellow-ministers who together with the undersigned know themselves bound by their ordination vow to

* These letters written by Dr. Hermann Sasse, professor of Symbolics and Church History at Erlangen and a member of the Breslau Free Church congregation in Frankfurt a. M., have been sent to us and to many pastors and professors of Lutheran Church bodies throughout the world for perusal, circulation, and translation. To date four letters have reached us. Others are to follow. God willing, they will be translated for publication in the *Quartalschrift* by members of our faculty and by a few pastors of our Synod who have volunteered to take over one or the other letter for translation. We hope that these letters will also be published in other theological journals of this and other countries, that they will be translated into the languages of all the foreign countries where the Lutheran Church has found a home. Therefore we are placing these letters, as translated by us, at the disposal of those editorial staffs that have not undertaken a translation of their own, or do not intend to do so. For we hold that the content of these letters deserves a careful study on the part of every Lutheran reader. However, to help our readers to a correct evaluation of this and other letters of Professor Sasse we should underscore that he has been a member of the Ev. Luth. Church of Bavaria and a professor of its theological faculty at Erlangen for many years and has only recently joined the Ev. Luth. Church of Old Prussia (Breslau Free Church) for reasons of conscience.

THE EDITORIAL STAFF.

the Holy Scriptures as the *norma normans* of all the doctrines of the Church and to the Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church as the true interpretation of the Scriptures. They are addressed to brethren whose hearts bleed, whenever they see the condition in which the Lutheran Church of our day and of our world finds itself. We know full well: Not only we as theologians see and labor under these distressing conditions. Numberless members of our congregations share our experience and sense the reason for the Church's need. But we, as the incumbents of the *ministerium ecclesiasticum* defined by Article V of the *Augustana*, have this duty toward the Christian congregation, to gain a clear understanding of the *status of the Lutheran Church in the world*, of the cause and the ultimate reason for her need, and to do our utmost, as far as mortals can do anything in this matter, to overcome this need.

1.

At the first glance we may gain the impression as if the status of the Lutheran Church were a more splendid one than ever before in her history. We can point to the "Lutheran World Federation," which represents an organized merger of the churches of the *Invariata* as has never before been realized in the history of our Church, not even in the most favorable times of the old "Lutheran World Council." This World Federation and its constituent churches have evolved efficient organizations, which are without comparison in the history of our Church. We but have to remind ourselves of the large relief-organizations of American fellow-believers, who came to the aid of the needy churches of Europe; or of the colossal work which is being conducted from Geneva by Dr. S. C. Michelfelder and Dr. Stewart Herman. One can also point to clear signs of a considerable outward progress in the Lutheran Churches of other lands, as, for instance, the union movement of the Lutheran Churches of America. This movement at least had this result that the relationship of the Lutherans, who had stood in sharp opposition to each other, has become an entirely different and better one. This is perhaps the deepest impression of the fully altered church conditions of Lutheranism in the United States gained by the undersigned when

he for the first time after 22 years was permitted to visit the Lutheran Churches of the New World at the exceedingly friendly invitation of the Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod. Even in Germany Lutheranism occasionally shows signs of life, although it has been robbed of its influence on the world and although its most recent history is one large chain of ecclesiastical political defeats. That a number of professors as members of a non-Lutheran faculty like that at Heidelberg, which legally can never become Lutheran, personally subscribe to the *Augustana Invariata* and teach accordingly, even more so than is done on old faculties nominally still Lutheran — who would not find in this a cause for rejoicing. And also in the Ecumenical Movement of our day, in the recently established Council of Churches, the Lutheran Churches are well represented and are the recipients of many a compliment. At first glance everything seems to be in the best of order, the Lutheran Church even in the ascendancy. What do we mean when we, in view of these circumstances, speak of a dire need of our Church? That there should be a need, even an urgent need of the Lutheran Church, is that not perhaps but the view of a few malcontents and pessimists, whom no one has to take seriously?

2.

The need of the Lutheran Church becomes apparent in that she is denied the right to exist as a church and that she has put up with it more or less. It is the Reformed Church, or to be more exact, the Reformed Churches of various shades of confession, who are willing to tolerate Lutheranism as an imperfect semi-Catholic form of Evangelical Christianity, even as they also put up with Anglicanism. This is only done under the condition that the Lutheran Church considers herself as one section and one form of the one Evangelical Church and therefore remains with the Reformed Church in the *communio in sacris*. For according to the opinion of the Swiss Reformers, as it especially becomes apparent in the far-reaching church politics of Calvin, the Evangelical Church is the church of the *sola scriptura*, different types of interpretation of the Scriptures having led to different formations of this one Evangelical Church, which do not exclude but

supplement each other. In this sense all great Reformed theologians have understood the coexistence of Lutheran and Reformed Churches. Schleiermacher and Karl Barth, both living in lands of the German tongue, — despite the differences otherwise existing between them — have said it with almost the same words, namely that the difference in doctrine between Lutherans and Reformed is one of the theological school, but not one of the Church. Both have brought their theological convictions to bear on church politics: Schleiermacher as one of the founding fathers and as the actual church father of the Prussian Union; Barth as the founder and sponsor of that “Confessional Union” which in 1934 was formed at Barmen in opposition to the confessional Lutherans, in that a mixed Synod composed of Lutherans, Reformed, and United theologians framed a doctrinal declaration and thereby claimed the right to judge between pure and false doctrine in the Evangelical Church. If even in Germany the significance of this step was not understood — which in 1948 logically led to the founding of the Evangelical Church in Germany, including Lutheran, Reformed, and United Churches, as the legal and actual successor of the German Evangelical Church of 1933 — how was one to understand this step in foreign countries, where one was not able to see anything else in regard to Barmen than the courageous protest against the encroachments of the State on the legal sphere of the Church and where one knew nothing or little of the conflict which confessional Lutheranism carried on in favor of a confessional solution of the church problem? We repeat, no one knew anything or little of the conflict because of the wholly onesided information transmitted by the International Press, which again was under the control of the sponsors of this new union. In the Nordic lands, with a few laudable exceptions, Calvinistic church-politics were not known, because Calvinism never had been in the land. In America Lutheran and Reformed churches exist side by side as separate churches and apart from a few territories like Pennsylvania the question of a union between Lutherans and Reformed has nowhere really ever arisen. Added to this the Lutherans in the other parts of the world, whose forefathers at one time emigrated because of the secularization and the unionism of their home-

churches, and founded Lutheran confessional churches in their new homelands, lost, by failing to retain their German language, a knowledge of the above-mentioned events of German church history. Therefore we are face to face with the fact that world-Lutheranism, occupied with the task of setting up an imposing outward structure, does not at all become aware of having lost the ground under its feet in that the Christian world contested its right to exist as an independent church. In the Germany of the 19th century the claim of an independent church-existence was made in such a manner that the Lutherans demanded a church government in accord with the Lutheran Confessions, claiming that "the church government as an important part of the Church must also, as far as orthodox doctrine and administration of the Sacraments are concerned, be in harmony with the church which it is to govern. Therefore it is not permissible to unite, by means of a common church government, churches which are not in agreement with one another as to doctrine and the administration of the Sacraments." With these sentences Theodor Kliefoth at the General Evangelical Lutheran Conference, the first ecumenical organization of Lutheranism in 1868, opposed the theological statement of the Prussian unionists that the Lutheran Confessions do not demand a confessional church government, since the unity of the Church only consists in the *consentire de doctrina evangelii et de administratione sacramentorum* and not in a fixed constitution. That this *consentire* can also obtain under a mixed church government was the opinion of the sponsors of the union at that time and is their opinion today. But if the conflict in the German Church since 1933 had one definite result, it was the knowledge that a church cannot adhere to its confession for any length of time as long as only the pastors and the congregations are bound to the confession, but not also the church government. Therefore the newly formed EKD actually does regard its church government as bound not only to the Holy Scriptures, but also to the Confessions of the Ancient Church and to "the decisions of the first Confessional Church passed at Barmen." In other words, practically speaking, the church government is bound to the doctrinal decisions of the "Theological Declaration" of Barmen, which has been taken over by many Land churches into the ordina-

tion formulas and vows of the church elders. Now as regards the Confessions of the Lutheran Reformation, they are still being recognized in the Lutheran territories of the EKD. But since the Reformed and United Confessions in the respective constituent churches within the EKD are regarded as having equal rights, the Lutheran Confessions are actually being robbed of that binding dogmatical force whereby the unity of the Church is safeguarded. With it Lutheranism ceases to be a church. From the Reformed viewpoint it is understood to be a movement of the Evangelical Church, a theological school. Indeed, it regards itself as just that since the factual recognition of Barmen, and only in this sense some Lutheran Land churches have united as the "United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Germany" to represent the union of Lutheranism in the EKD. Concerning this EKD its founders, also the Lutheran bishops of Germany, say, only with somewhat different words, exactly what Frederick William III declared in regard to the Prussian Union as introduced by him: "It does not purpose and signify a relinquishing of the hitherto existing confession. Also the authority which the two Evangelical creeds had till now has not thereby been annulled. By joining it one merely expresses that spirit of moderation and charitableness which no longer regards the differences between the two creeds in point of doctrine as a reason to deny each other outward church-fellowship. Consequently unionism in Germany actually has gained a victory over confessionalism. Likewise the Reformed conception of the Evangelical Church and of the church confessions has gained a victory over the Lutheran. The conception of the Confession of the Church, as we find it unequivocally expressed in Luther's Large Confession of 1528, in his Smalcald Articles, and in the Formula of Concord, and as it is also presupposed in the *Augustana*, is now quite impossible. What Karl Barth calls the "pious and free relativism" of the Reformed Confession has now taken the place of that definiteness with which the Lutheran Confession regards its doctrinal content as the doctrinal content of the Holy Scriptures, from which one "cannot depart or give way in anything" and with which Luther and the confessors of the Formula of Concord wanted "to appear with intrepid hearts before the judgment-seat

of Jesus Christ, and give an account of it." The *quia* of the confessional oath has given way to the non-obligatory *quatenus*. From this attempt at making the Confession something relative it is only a short step to its invalidation, a step which has been taken already in large parts of Reformed Christendom. But this development means practically nothing less than that in the Lutheranism of the German churches the heretofore valid and legally accepted Formula of Concord has been invalidated. For no theologian will earnestly maintain that the spirit of moderation and charitableness, which once gained command in Prussia and now in all of Germany, can be brought into accord with the condemnations which the Formula of Concord has voiced against Calvinism and Crypto-Calvinism, although with the express reservation that it does not intend to deprive erring Reformed churches of the character of a church of Christ.

Now the shocking part of this development is that it has not only taken place in Germany. It was not a mere chance occurrence that neither from Nordic Lutheranism nor from the Lutheran Churches of America including the Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod a loud warning has been voiced in regard to this wrong undertaking. Also no definite repudiation of the "Evangelical Church of Germany" and of the "United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Germany," which is very closely joined up with the former, has been voiced. One can explain this in part because of the extraordinary difficulty to understand the development in Germany and to correctly evaluate its significance. But this difficulty is not the only explanation. The deepest reason is rather to be sought in the fact that a similar development, although in a different manner, has taken place also in these churches. In the Nordic churches it is a result of the Reformed influences in the Ecumenical Movement. Here one understands Lutheranism as one of the great historical growths of Protestantism, which can be blended with other forms into a higher unity without losing its own peculiar rights and manner of existence. Especially in the Church of Sweden it has been forgotten that there is also an ecumenical movement which, of course, seeks a new relationship of the creeds, but which also knows that the great creeds do not only supplement but also exclude one another.

The strong dogmatical character of the Confessions and with it the import of the condemnations which exclude church union have been forgotten. Apparently both in Scandinavia and in Germany this is the result of an influence of liberalism within the Church. This liberalism, which, it is true, is publicly being declared dead, has in reality permeated all theology and thereby has conquered the Church in a seemingly harmless and yet extremely dangerous manner. And something quite similar has taken place in America. There, strange enough, liberalism calls itself neo-orthodoxy and as such it has gained access to Lutheran faculties which formerly were inaccessible to all liberal influences. Step by step one can trace the weakening of the dogmatical heritage in the inability of the old orthodoxy to win the youth and to render an explanation of the present-day problems. This change has become evident in the fate of the Galesburg Rule of 1875 which conforms to the above-cited principle of the German Lutherans of 1868: "Lutheran pulpits are for Lutheran ministers only; Lutheran altars are for Lutheran communicants only." While already the matter of fact way with which the abolition of this principle was accepted in America, no conclusions being drawn from it in regard to church-unity, already predicted a weakening of the approved rule on which in the United States the valid existence of a real Lutheran Church as church depends, the American conditions themselves make it apparent that it was not anymore understood and taken seriously. But not only on special occasions do American Lutherans, as the Scandinavians are wont to do, practice communion-fellowship with those of another persuasion, but one can, for instance, read in the church bulletin of one of the largest Lutheran churches of Philadelphia: "Members of other churches who believe in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and in the forgiveness of sin through Him are welcome to join with us in this sacred Sacrament." Instances could readily be adduced to show that in regard to pulpit-fellowship matters are still worse, which should cause every Lutheran theologian to blush for shame. But all this happens in churches that play a leading part in the Lutheran World Federation. Not in order to carry on polemics, but to understand the ailment of Lutheranism, to which virtually all Lutheran churches in the world are

prone, we state the objective and historic-dogmatical facts of the case, namely that the Lutheran Churches of our time — with exceptions which we do not want to mention here — that at least the leading churches of the world are not any longer churches in the light of the Formula of Concord. And if we hear the rejoinder that the Formula of Concord is not being accepted by all churches, that the Lutheran Church is the church of the *Augustana*, then we must join our fathers in answering that one can be a Lutheran without the Formula of Concord, but one cannot be a Lutheran in opposition to it. We must answer that the *Augustana* is no longer understood as Luther and the confessors of 1530 understood it if one no longer understands the *improbant secus docentes* of its Article X as a demarcation line of the church, but only as a boundary line of the theological school. This, then, is the dire need of our Church that in that very moment in which she begins to step before the world as one of the great Confessions of Christendom to testify to the world and to the Ecumenical Movement the truth of the Lutheran Reformation, she is about to lose, or to a great extent already has lost, that very truth.

3.

How are we to explain this need? Where are its roots? They cannot be sought in one country only. If German Lutheranism disintegrated through National-Socialism, if the Nordic State and Land Churches not influenced by National Socialism, and if the American Free Churches have also fallen prey to the disintegration of Lutheranism, then the cause must be sought in Lutheranism itself. It cannot possibly be found in the church politics of Calvinism. For then we would have to ask at once why the Lutheran Churches did no longer have that power of resistance which they had in the 16th and 17th century. We, of course, have to admit that the events in Lutheranism about which we are concerned also have their parallels in other creeds and therefore some of the reasons are at least to be sought in a development which is running through all of modern Christendom. The clearest example of this is the noteworthy fact that the present pope had to proceed with all means of Roman church

discipline against certain excesses of the liturgical and the so-called *Una Sancta* movement, in which the dividing line separating from Protestantism also became doubtful for Catholics, even for truly pious Catholics, so that they crossed it in conscious opposition to the canonical law. Did it not happen in the eastern parts of Germany — it had already happened in the Siberian prison-camps of World War I — that Catholic communion was administered to Protestants? Without a doubt, a weakening of the fixed confessional boundary lines has come about in all of modern Christendom. The Ecumenical Movement has contributed its share, especially since its leadership has been transferred from the Anglicans, who were still interested in regulations and dogma, to the truly Reformed Churches. And what would the fathers of the Faith-and-Order-Movement say to the fact that the great event of the World Council of Lausanne in 1927, the renewed acceptance of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Confession as the basis for the ecumenical work, was so rapidly bypassed in favor of what had now become the order of the day? But beyond this, there must be in Lutheranism itself a reason for the weakening of its dogmatical substance. In Germany it can be explained in part by the extinction of two theological generations. Whole families in which Lutheran theology and Lutheran faith were a living tradition, died out in the two World Wars. In America the decline of the German language played an important role. Not one of Luther's great writings on the Lord's Supper has been put into English. But this does not explain everything. Why were these writings not translated? Why do Anglo-Catholics and Roman Catholics believe in the real presence? Why do leading Scandinavian bishops — concerning those who are less renowned one knows nothing, at least they have not voiced their opinion — reject Luther's teachings on the Lord's Supper in their own church? One cannot explain all this by saying that the untenableness of Luther's exegesis has become apparent. For no serious-minded exegete, even in the Reformed Church, will understand the *est* of the words of the institution as *significat*. That was reserved for the Lutheran "dogmaticians" of today who know nothing of exegesis. The question also has to be raised whether the Benedictine esoteric theology, which was recently appraised by a

German "Lutheran" theologian in the official organ of the German Lutheran bishops as the real meaning of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, has, after all, the least foothold in the Holy Scriptures. — No, this whole decadence of Lutheran doctrine must have another reason for which there is no rational explanation. It is the dying away of a faith which hides itself, as many another decline in the spiritual life of Christendom, behind a theological trend which seems to be on the up-grade. And as is the case with every decline in Christian life, so also this one goes hand in hand with a shocking weakness of character. To put it very frankly: The present-day theologians do no longer believe what they say and do no longer say what they believe. What great characters were the liberals of the past century who in public worship refused to confess the Apostolic Creed, because they did not anymore believe some of its pronouncements! Today no theologian stumbles over such thin threads. We have no Sydow, Schrempf, or Knote incident anymore; not because our times have a greater desire for dogma, but because theologians are no longer serious-minded in regard to their own confession and to confession as such. This is true despite all confessional movements of our times. No confessional church would dare to exclude one from its midst who denies the Trinity or the Incarnation of Jesus Christ. And that heresy has not yet been discovered which would compromise a pastor in one of our Lutheran Land churches. At the most it could only be the very untimely and inopportune loyalty to the Formula of Concord. Here, of course, all tolerance ceases and that for no other reason than that it would involve insubordination toward a practically unconfessional church government. Proudly our churches acknowledge the fact that errorists are no longer being disciplined. They do not suspect that they are leaving it to Rome to defend the fundamental truths of the Apostolic and the Nicene Creeds without which there is no Church. And they do not realize that thereby they are placing themselves into an impossible contrast to the Scriptures, which, as is well known, very earnestly war against heresy and urge such warfare upon the Church of all times. What would have become of the Church, if she had not taken up arms against the heresies of the second, fourth, and

sixteenth centuries, but had hoped, as present-day bishops are doing, that of itself the truth would carry the day.

Thus it is a serious weakness which has befallen our church, and which is undoubtedly to be associated with the fate of Christendom as such. God has not blessed Christianity with a new revival as he had done in the decades following the Napoleonic era. It may be that it will come yet, but still now we are not aware of it. The spiritual life of the Catholic Church of the world, excepting in a few countries like Germany, which, however, are not being heard, shows signs of an apparent decline. The present pope when elected in 1939 was one of the intellectuals of Europe. Today, because of his political undertakings and his superstitious belief in the Madonna of Fatima as the liberator from Bolshevism, he has lowered himself to the level of a Pius IX. What human respect did one have in the twenties for the preachers of the social gospel in the Reformed Churches of America! They at least had the courage of an independent conviction. Today they have that conviction which the daily press may momentarily have, which, so to speak, is no conviction at all. Where in independent America is there a Reformed churchman who has the power and the courage with which Karl Barth as a lone "voice in Switzerland" spoke to his people and its church? There were men in the Reformed world, who once spoke so courageously against the destruction of the dignity of man and the disregard of human rights in National Socialism. Where are the men today who now do not criticize Communism only, but also oppose, in no uncertain terms, the trampling underfoot of people in Spain and by Latin-American Neo-Fascism? There were such voices, but they are silenced. — No, the appearance of Christendom today is everything else but uplifting, even in the most elevating moments of a convention like that of Amsterdam. The need of the Lutheran Church is *mutatis mutandis* the need of all churches.

4.

We must keep all of this in mind when putting the question: what is to be done? What *are we to do*, dear brethren, who have been intrusted with the ministerial office of the Lutheran Church in times so decisive for the Church and the world? Nothing would

be more wrong than if we would wait for that which others will do. The World Conference will take its course in accordance with the law by which it was guided at the outset. We cannot expect it to know what the church of the Formula of Concord is, and to act accordingly. This does not imply that we do not support and aid it everywhere where we are able to do so. From it we can expect an inner renewal of Lutheranism as little as from any other ecclesiastical organization, not even from the organization of our own church. Also from our bishops, synods, church-presidents, and faculties we can expect nothing, nothing at all. We are not to wait for an extraordinary miracle, for a new outpouring of the Holy Spirit. That would be altogether un-Lutheran. If God should once more grant us a revival and thereby a renewal of our church, that rests with God's omnipotence alone. That which we are able to do is threefold. First of all we can make ourselves see the status of our church and of Christendom. We must understand, of course, that the question is not how the legendary 80 million Lutherans of the world, who really are not in existence but have been invented by exceedingly superficial and thoughtless statistics, can be merged into a powerful organism. We must know, however, how those can be congregated from the midst of that poor, stricken, and feeble Lutheranism for whom the Lutheran Confession is not a mere pretence, but, as it was for Luther and the signatories of the Confessions, a matter of life and death, of eternal life and eternal death, because it is a matter pertaining to the everlasting truth of the Holy Scriptures, which concerns all peoples and all churches of Christendom. Indeed, not such a one thinks and acts in an ecumenical fashion who looks upon the Confessions as something relative, who reduces them to a low level and practically does away with them, but who, like Luther, searches for the one truth of the one Gospel for the one Church. Let us again become *confessional Lutherans* for the sake of the unity of the Church.

The second thing that we must do to attain this end and the thing that we can do without difficulty, is that we again study the Confessions, that we again and again compare them with the Holy Scripture, and that we constantly learn to gauge their interpreta-

tion of the Scriptures and their Scripture proofs more profoundly. As the Roman Catholic has the daily duty to read his breviary, a tedious and difficult task, thus our duty must be, next to the thorough study of the Scriptures, the unflagging study of the Confessions. In this manner let us begin prayerfully to read Luther's Large Catechism, even as Luther, although an old Doctor, still was not ashamed to pray the Catechism daily. The deepest cause for the failure of the German church conflict is none other but that everyone always spoke about the Confessions, appealed to them, but knew them too little. We do not only need this insight for ourselves, our teaching, and our preaching, but very much so for our congregations. At the last large convention of the United Lutheran Church in America an engineer made the statement, by the way in agreement with the president of the church, Dr. Fry, that the church is in need of theologians, that it calls for theologians. The Christian congregation of the present day in all lands and of all creeds is tired of the undogmatical, devotional character of the ethical sermon, which changes its theme every year. It demands in a manner which we pastors frequently do not at all understand a substantial dogmatical sermon, a doctrinal sermon in the best sense of the word. If our contemporaries do not find it in the Lutheran Church, then the hunger for doctrine drives them into other denominations. Therefore lay hold on the Confessions, dear brethren in the ministry, by yourselves and together with others.

The third thing, however, that we must learn anew is Luther's invincible faith in the power of the means of grace. Whatever the Church still has and still does should not be minimized. But she does not live from mercy, or from political and social activity. She does not subsist on large numbers. When will the terrible superstition of the Christendom of our day cease that only there Jesus Christ is powerful where two or three millions are gathered together in His name! When will we again comprehend that the Church lives by the means of grace of the pure preaching of the Gospel and by the divinely instituted administration of the Sacraments and by nothing else. And for no other reason but because Jesus Christ the Lord is present in His means of grace and builds His Church on earth, being even as

powerful as ever before in the history of the Church — even if His power and glory, to speak with our Confessions, are *crucetum*, hidden under the Cross. Oh, what a secret unbelief and what little faith we find in the Church which calls herself the Church of the *sola fide!* May God in His grace eradicate this unbelief and strengthen this little faith in our souls and renew us through the great faith of the New Testament and the Reformation. That and that alone is the manner of overcoming the urgent need of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the greatest and weightiest crisis of her history.

To all of you, whether I am acquainted with you or whether you are strangers to me, wherever you may be sojourners, in whichever Lutheran Church you may be serving, I in the fellowship of the Lutheran faith extend my most heartfelt greetings for the Advent Season and for the beginning of the New Church Year.

Your devoted and faithful

HERMANN SASSE.

Translated by P. PETERS.

ANCIENT HERESIES IN MODERN GARB

II. Heresies Which Limit the Implications of the Fall of Man

Another doctrine of basic importance is that which deals with the Fall of Man, particularly with the effect which the Fall of Adam has had on mankind in general. It is important because of the bearing which it has on man's need of salvation, it is important also because history has shown that a departure from the simple Biblical truth of this doctrine has invariably been accompanied by far reaching and serious effects, particularly on the doctrines of grace and salvation. And there have been departures from Biblical truth in this matter, shocking departures. This does not mean that the fact of the Fall was questioned, — that is taught so clearly in Scripture that it has seldom been challenged except by those who for one reason or another have preferred to treat the entire story as an allegory. But it is a different

matter when we come to the implications of the Fall, when the question is asked, JUST WHAT HAS MAN SUFFERED IN THE FALL?

Let us consider the Biblical answer first. According to Scripture the consequences of the Fall are universal and absolute. Its implications for the status of man and for the problem of his salvation are profound. It brought sin and death into the world, for "As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." (Rom. 5:12.) Like some vicious plague that has gained a foothold in a community the moral infection of sin has swept through the entire world until it has marked all as its victims save One. For "there is none that doeth good, no, not one. . . . For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." (Rom. 3:12. 23.) This condition is one in which we are born. "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." (Ps. 51:5.) Since like begets like, the offspring can be no different from the parent. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." (John 3:6.) The implications of these facts are tremendous. "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John 3:5.) The mind of man, the reason, the intellect of which he is so proud, falls under a tremendous condemnation: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." (1 Cor. 2:14.) The natural, unregenerate mind of man simply has not what it takes to understand and participate in spiritual things. The natural will of man stands in instinctive and stubborn opposition to God. "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." (Rom. 8:7.) In short, on every count the Word of God denies to man the ability to help himself in matters of spiritual nature, pertaining to the welfare of his soul. The Apostle is only summing the entire situation up in a single word when he tells his Christians that in their former, unregenerate state they were *dead* in trespasses and sins. (Eph. 2:1.) That is an absolute statement, and carries with it the inescapable implication that in spiritual matters the abilities of natural man are to be rated at zero.

We have every reason, therefore, to be thankful for the clear and sound statement which we find in our Augsburg Confession where in the Article OF ORIGINAL SIN we read:

“Also they teach that since the fall of Adam, all men begotten in the natural way are born with sin, that is, without the fear of God, without trust in God, and with concupiscence; and that this disease, or vice of origin, is truly sin, even now condemning and bringing eternal death upon those not born again through Baptism and the Holy Ghost.” (Art. II.)

The implications of this condition, the absolute lack of all spiritual powers which follows, are shown even more clearly in the German version: “dass sie alle von Mutterleibe an voll böser Lust und Neigung sind und keine wahre Gottesfurcht, keinen wahren Glauben an Gott von Natur haben können.” There can be no mistake about where the men of Augsburg stood on the question, **JUST WHAT HAS MAN SUFFERED IN THE FALL?** Their answer is clear and to the point. Man has brought utter ruin and corruption upon his soul.

As we turn the pages of history we find that other answers have been given. The name that stands at the head of everyone's list in this respect is that of a British monk, Pelagius, who came to Rome at about the beginning of the Fifth Century, at a time when the Gothic tribes under Alaric were beginning to sweep into Italy, where they were soon to plunder and loot the Holy City of Rome itself. Since there was more than the usual degree of corruption and vice rampant in this ancient city, Pelagius, who was an earnest and able man, soon became an acknowledged leader in a movement that aimed at a reform of these deplorable conditions. Pelagius soon decided that there had been too much preaching of grace and forgiveness, too much stress on what God does for man, and not enough on what man must do for himself. Particularly he objected to the doctrine of original sin, holding that if one tells men that they are evil by nature, they will feel that there is little use in trying to be good. He reasoned that if one wishes to inspire men to make an effort in this direction, one must fill them with the idea that they are able to succeed. So he

came to stress the capacity of human nature for good. In a letter to a friend he writes: "Whenever I have to speak concerning moral instruction and holy living I am accustomed to point out first *the force and quality of human nature and what it is able to accomplish* and then to incite the mind of the hearer to many kinds of virtue, since it is not without profit to be summoned to those things which perhaps he has assumed are impossible to him. For we are by no means able to tread the way of virtue unless we have hope as a companion." (McGiffert, *History of Christian Thought*, II, 125f.)

Soon he began to unfold his own views concerning the Fall of Adam. Maintaining that sin was entirely a matter of the will and of the individual, he claimed that it would not be transmitted. Believing that only the body, the flesh of each human being was traceable to his parents, and through them to Adam, and that the soul in each instance was a new creation of God and therefore inclined to be good, he taught that as far as their nature and abilities are concerned, all human beings are in the same condition as Adam was at the beginning, every man having it completely within his power to create his own destiny and to mold his own character. No matter at what stage in life man may come to such a resolve, he is able to choose as he will with perfect freedom. Pelagius went farther, teaching not only that man can live without sin, but expressing the belief that in certain cases that had actually been achieved. — The fact that there was nevertheless so much sin in the world, so that even to Pelagius it was for all practical purposes a universal condition, he explained by referring to the force of example and environment. Since children see the example of their sinful parents and note the same in almost every one else, it is not surprising that they soon find themselves in the same condition, — not because they have fallen in Adam, but because of their own individual fall. In stating these views Pelagius was not really proclaiming a new doctrine. He was only saying more bluntly and with greater emphasis what had been taught and believed particularly in the Eastern part of the Church for quite a time, namely that man has certain powers which are unimpaired by the Fall, and that it rests with him to use them to the best advantage. When Paul of Samosata and other Eastern

teachers emphasized the humility of Jesus Christ at the expense of His Deity, and did so in order to bring Him closer to men as a teacher and an example, they not only had the same end in view, but sought to reach it by the same means.

One may ask whether Pelagius knew nothing of the Apostle Paul's teaching that we are justified by faith, without works, or whether he was not familiar with the doctrine of God's grace. The fact is that Pelagius not only knew the writings of St. Paul, but that he himself was the author of a notable commentary on Paul's Epistles. His commentary on Romans is still extant, and is said to be the oldest known book by a British author. When Pelagius spoke of grace he meant God's help, but help as it is offered in the instruction and enlightenment which God gives to man through His Word. Justification in the sense of forgiveness of sins without merit, through faith alone, was recognized by him. But it was limited to an initial forgiveness of past sins, after which one is expected to live without sin, as Pelagius claimed man was able to do. According to all this Christianity was still chiefly a moral system, with the emphasis on the deeds of man rather than those of God.

In these same times the very opposite of these views was being taught by Augustine, bishop of a relatively small church in Hippo, North Africa. Through personal experience Augustine had learned what it means to be helplessly shackled by the fetters of sin, to know the power of the flesh as Paul pictures it in Romans 7. He had learned what it means to despair when one knows one's need of help, but cannot find it within one's self to take the steps that are needed toward attaining it. Against this dark background of the utter helplessness of man in matters pertaining to his eternal salvation he had learned to understand what the grace which God offers in Scripture really means to man: that it is grace alone which brings about the conversion of the sinner; how faith is a gift of God's grace, and in itself an incontrovertible token of the gracious working of the Spirit in the heart of man; how the very fact that a believer comes to faith is due to the previous fact that in His grace God has predestined him unto salvation. (It must be recognized that at this point Augustine fell into the error of concluding that therefore God

must also have predestined the unbeliever to eternal condemnation. In this respect Augustine is the forerunner of Calvin with his doctrine of a twofold predestination. But our concern at this moment is merely to note Augustine's understanding of the truth that the predestination of a believer unto faith is due to God's eternal election of grace.) We can find many flaws in the theology of Augustine, but the fact remains that perhaps for the first time since the days of the Apostles the blessed truth that the salvation of man is solely the work of God's grace was again set forth in all its glory.

It was inevitable that there should be a clash between two teachings so diametrically opposed as those of Augustine and Pelagius. The latter was by no means without a following, but the position which he had taken was so extreme that it could not be successfully defended. Pelagianism was condemned, first in the West, under the leadership of Augustine, then also in the East, although with considerably less clearness and conviction. However, Pelagianism was far from dead. The feeling persisted that there must be some good left in natural man, some area where these good qualities must have an opportunity to operate. The result was a modified form of Pelagianism, which avoided the indefensible extremes and offered a compromise that, indeed, seemed quite reasonable. This doctrine is called Semi-Pelagianism. It was advocated by certain teachers in southern Gaul, and soon came into quite general acceptance. According to these Semi-Pelagians the spiritual powers of man have been greatly weakened by the Fall, but not destroyed entirely. There is enough good left in man so that he can by his own free will make one very vital decision. He can decide that he wants to be saved. He can turn to God for help. Seeing this, God rewards these efforts with a fitting measure of help, or grace. Whether, however, this will lead to faith or not, that still lies with the free will of man. God's help will be available there too, but only as a co-operation (concomitant grace, as opposed to prevenient grace). It will be recognized that Augustine's *sola gratia* had gone by the board.

A swing back into the direction of Augustinism took place at the Second Council of Orange, 529, about a century after Augustine's death. The chief difference between this and Semi-

Pelagianism was that here it was recognized that God's grace must come first, since the loss of man's spiritual powers was complete. Salvation was once more spoken of as being by grace alone. But while this Council was to enjoy official recognition for centuries to come, yet the interpretation which it received at the hands of Catholic teachers and the manner in which it was subsequently developed was such that the name Semi-Pelagian accurately describes the doctrine of that church to this day. One teacher, Thomas Aquinas, did teach that the grace of God must precede any spiritual movement on the part of man. But another, Duns Scotus, asserted that man still had the power to take the first step, and that he therefore must be held to make this contribution to his own conversion. And there, as far as Rome is concerned, the matter stands.

For Lutherans, however, who understand the full implications of the Fall of Man, who are aware of the total depravity and the utter spiritual corruption of natural man, who see the wonder of God's grace the more clearly because of the dark background against which it appears, there can be no doubt about what stand they will take on this question of the co-operation of man in matters of his salvation: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast." (Eph. 2: 8f.)

* * * *

In tracing this ancient heresy in its modern garb it is not our intention to go into the position of Rome at greater length, although certainly much might still be said on this score. The role of Rome is that of a medium which has preserved this factor of error through the centuries and provided it with a favorable environment for further development. If we refer to it at all, it shall be only to establish the historical and particularly also the logical connection. There is just such a connection. Rome teaches that there remains something in man which is not impaired or taken from him by the Fall, so that he is able to use this remnant of strength for the purpose of taking the first step, even though it be but a weak and faltering one, in the direction of God. The modern idea is that there is a core of innate good in man which

may and therefore should be developed. There is little difference between the two. We find this modern idea, for instance, among the Unitarians. One reason why these advocates of liberal religion, liberal on the basis of the supreme guidance of reason, are able to dispense so blithely with the Godhead of the Savior is that (as Neve puts it) they have buried the Biblical doctrine of original sin and the resultant sinful condition of the human heart under an impossible optimism in which they sound their slogan of "salvation by character" and rally to the defense of what they call "the essential dignity of man and the perfectibility of human nature." It has rightly been pointed out that human nature is perfectible, but only by the Gospel of a Crucified Christ, and by the power of the Holy Spirit. Unitarianism proposes to achieve this without these divine essentials, revealing thereby once more its essentially non-Christian character.

The pity of it is, however, that under the guise of liberal thought these views have found increasing acceptance in those denominations in which Modernism has gained a foothold, or perhaps even control. The complacency with which American Protestantism for a long time viewed a non-religious system of education as we have it in our public school system was due largely to the fact it was believed that such a system could really build character, not merely from a civic point of view, but in a way that would be quite acceptable to Christians also. When the Sunday School was developed in connection with this new method of education, it was never meant to carry the entire burden of the spiritual training of the child, but merely to supplement the character building of public education with some additional material of a specifically Christian nature. If there is general alarm at the situation today, if there is in such circles a general demand for the introduction of the Bible into the public schools, if various systems of part time religious instruction by the respective churches are advocated, all these measures still strike one as stop-gap devices. The true nature of the problem, the utter corruption of natural man, has not yet been faced, and therefore also not understood. The doctrine of original sin is still considered a relic of medieval superstition and ignorance. For one can go far among modern Protestant denominations before finding a

satisfactory position concerning the necessity of infant baptism. There are denominations which practice infant baptism, there are others which postpone this sacrament until the so-called years of discretion. But even such denominations which practice it, usually treat it rather indulgently, as though it were a commendable custom, but fail to see any serious consequences if perchance it should be omitted. In spite of the clear statements of Scripture they are not ready to give up the plausible and attractive idea of the innocence of infancy. This is the basic error which keeps these people from seeing the problem of a non-religious training of the child in its proper light.

This same mistaken idea of the inherent good, the idea that it is possible for man to develop this quality to a high level of moral respectability and worthiness without making himself dependent upon the saving grace of God, we meet also in the moralizing teachings which are characteristic of the secret orders of our day — lodge religion — and of which there is more than a slight trace in the literature of that preparatory school for lodge membership which calls itself Boy Scouts of America. If these organizations would confine themselves to teaching good conduct for its citizenship value only, no one could fault them for it — nor would this writer be inclined to do so. But the manner in which these moral teachings are connected with religious thought is made very plain by the prayers and rituals of the average lodge. The further fact that they attribute a definite value to conduct which complies with their moral code is stated in so many words in their burial rituals which do not hesitate to assure the survivors that because of the former brother's good conduct, because of his living up to the code of the Order, he has now reached the Grand Lodge above. To hold forth this hope without the redemptive work of Christ, to advocate these teachings without pointing to any Savior except to man himself, that is conclusive evidence that the people who desire these systems are hopelessly ignorant of what must be the starting point for any religious system that would offer a solution to the problem of the hereafter: recognition of the complete depravity of human nature, and of man's utter inability to help himself in spiritual things. They are

like some physician whose treatment of a case is sadly bungled because he missed his original diagnosis completely.

The matter is made more difficult in the case of Scouting, however, by the fact that this organization has no prayer ritual, no burial service. It furthermore officially declares that it means to train for good citizenship only, and is eager to leave all religious training to the various religious organizations which are willing to employ its material and cooperate in the training of their youth. It has been our contention, however, that because this organization connects its code for the character training of youth with the idea of "duty to God," and gives it backing with a solemn oath, and particularly because it suggests that by such means the Scout can bring himself into conscious harmony with his God, thereby fulfilling his duty to the immortal personality which he is, — that therefore it should be very clear that Scouting still retains certain religious elements, in spite of its avowed intention to turn this over to others.

If Rome supplied the logical premise for these ideas about developing the character of man by its view that in spite of the Fall something good was left in man, it must likewise be held responsible for another idea that was to work much havoc, the idea of the cooperation of natural man in regard to his conversion and faith. — Before we go any further it should be said that we may well speak of a cooperation of man with God in matters pertaining to his spiritual life, if namely it is clearly understood that we are speaking of regenerate man, of man who has been quickened by the power of the Spirit, of the New Man. He is God's workmanship, created unto good works, that he should walk in them. He is capable not only of living under our Lord Jesus Christ in His Kingdom, but, as Luther puts it, of "serving Him in everlasting righteousness, innocence, and blessedness." There is something radically wrong with a Christian when he ceases to show this activity of a new life. He is in imminent danger of falling under the judgment that faith which hath not works is dead. For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also. (James 2, 17. 26.)

But we are now speaking of unregenerate man, of man as he is by nature. It is in this condition that Rome still ascribes

to him the ability to take a few preliminary steps. It is at this point that a peculiar view of Rome finds expression. The entire doctrinal structure of this church leans so heavily on the idea of man's merit as a cause for his salvation that it must find merit also in these first few steps. For Rome wants to speak of grace. But grace, according to this theology, is not given except as a reward for some previous meritorious deed. Then it serves to supply the struggling sinner with a little additional strength, which he may or may not use. If he uses it faithfully, that again leads to a reward, another infusion of grace. Thus the spiral must repeat itself again and again until it either leads to a point where the requirements of God are satisfied, or breaks down because somewhere along the line the sinner has failed to make proper use of the infusions of grace which he has received. That there may still be a laborious and tedious making up for what is lacking at the time of death is taught in the familiar Roman doctrine of purgatory. Just where this begins to be the work of the New Man in the Roman system is not quite clear. It almost seems as though all of this is simply thought of as the cooperation of man, without any distinction between New and Old.

That these views did not find much favor in the churches of the Reformation is natural, at least as far as their crude form is concerned. But the idea that natural man can make some contribution to his conversion would not die. Shortly after the death of Luther certain Lutheran teachers, among them no less a man than Melancthon, the author of the Augsburg Confession, attempted to offer a solution to the problem why some men come to faith, others are lost. To attribute the former to God's grace alone, and the latter entirely to the fault of man was a solution that seemed to involve a logical contradiction, — does so in fact. For this is one of the many instances where our human reason is incapable of comprehending the wondrous and righteous ways of God. But instead of admitting the limitations of the human mind, these men began to suggest that in the conversion of man there must be three causes at work: the Word, the gracious Spirit of God, and the will of man which cooperates in this work and determines the outcome. The resultant teaching was Synergism, or the doctrine of cooperation, — a reasonable doctrine,

but one which places a serious limitation on the idea that it is the grace of God alone that saves man, and which at the same time falls far short of the true evaluation of the damage which had been wrought by the Fall of Man.

In spite of the prominence and prestige of Melancthon, the error was emphatically rejected in the Formula of Concord, some twenty years later. But even so, the idea continues to turn up. When our synods were confronted in recent years with a document of agreement that had been submitted as a basis for union between the American Lutheran Church and the Missouri Synod, this doctrine was one of the reasons why this first Declaration had to be followed by a Doctrinal Affirmation, and then by a revision of the Affirmation, all in an attempt to make it clear that this error no longer lurked in the wording of these various documents. For while the synods of the American Lutheran Church have emphatically disavowed Melancthonian Synergism, they have nevertheless undertaken to explain why some are saved and others not. It has been suggested in former years that the case of those who have come to faith is explained by the fact that they conducted themselves in a better way toward the grace of God, that they at least refrained from willful resistance to this grace. If one will but look closely, one will find there still is lurking in the background the old idea that there is some good left in man.

The entire matter comes up once more when we consider the question of the place that is to be assigned to faith in the very important doctrines of justification and election. Lutherans are agreed that the sinner is justified by grace, through faith. Yet it is not always clear just what function is being assigned to faith in the mind of the individual. We try to make it very clear that the function of faith is a purely receptive one. That alone is in keeping with the world-wide character of justification: that when we are told that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them (2 Cor. 5:19), we have the same truth before us that is expressed in the words with which we are told that He was delivered for our offenses and raised again for our justification. As the offenses for which He was delivered were those of the entire world, so the justification which was proclaimed by his triumphant

resurrection was that of all mankind. There God publishes to all the world the wondrous fact that all the sin of all mankind has been paid in full, that His justice has been completely satisfied. When the sinner believes this by the grace of God, he is not in any sense of the word helping to bring this glorious verdict to pass, nor is he by his faith making himself worthy of it. He is simply accepting and receiving it as what it is, a free gift of God's grace. This alone is in keeping with the nature of faith as trust, confidence, *fiducia*. But as soon as the thought arises that by this faith man is fulfilling a condition, and himself supplying a factor by which he now comes into personal possession of this righteousness, this justification, then the *sola gratia* is again forfeited and the purity of the Gospel lost. It was therefore not without reason that an explanation was requested of the article in the Declaration of the American Lutheran Church which stated that "God purposes to justify those who have come to faith." Does faith precede justification, or does justification precede faith? Only by the latter do we express the truth that justification is not only by grace, but by *grace alone*.

So also in the matter of God's election of grace. Did God in His eternal counsel choose His children because He foresaw that they would eventually believe, or is it because of His gracious election that they were brought to faith and thus became His children? In the former case man's faith is the cause of God's election, and man has after all made a vital contribution to his own salvation. In the latter case, however, God's election is the cause of man's faith; it is God who has done everything, and man who looks to God's grace for his entire hope of eternal life. Thus only do we come to the blessed assurance that *all* things are ready, that we need only to come to the Great Supper of our glorious King and receive the boundless blessings which are there spread before us.

Do these things stand in any connection with the subject of our discussion? Does this involve any limitations of the implications of the Fall of Man? Not by any intention of these Lutherans against whom we must record these confusing views. Of that I am sure. As much as we, they also wish to retain clearly the truths which are expressed in the Second Article of the Augsburg-

burg Confession. But if one claims to find the key to the question of God's eternal election in God's knowledge of what man is eventually to do, if one makes the choice of God contingent upon the faith which man will eventually demonstrate in response to God's message of grace, and if these factors are to provide a solution rather than merely to create another problem, then logic will demand that this contribution of faith be made by man when he is still in his natural, unregenerate state. It must still be claimed that this faith of man is the outcome of a process which he set in motion while he was still in his former lost condition. It is the old, familiar error, failure to grasp the full implications of the Fall of Man, which we discover even under this most modern garb.

Reason dare not be our guide in this. God's Word alone, rising beyond the power of our feeble understanding, can lead us safely in these all important matters. And that Word preaches salvation by the grace of God alone. Once more let us hear the words which make us divinely sure: "By grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast."

E. REIM.

LUTHER PRAISED BY CATHOLICS

John Henry Newman, the famous Anglican, later Roman Cardinal, says it was Luther's "wish to extirpate all notions of human merit; next to give peace and satisfaction to the troubled conscience."

Certainly a noble wish. Did Luther succeed? Let Newman say: "Luther's view of the gospel covenant met both the alleged evils against which it was provided. For if Christ has obeyed the Law instead of us, it follows that every believer has at once a perfect righteousness, yet not his own; that it is not his own, precludes all boasting, that it is perfect, precludes all anxiety. The conscience is unladen, without becoming puffed up." — "Lect. on Justif.," p. 26.

Luther lectured on Romans in 1515. Jesuit Grisar has this to say: "On perusing the lengthy pages of the *Commentary on*

Romans we are amazed at the eloquence of the young author, at his dexterity in description and his skill in the apt use of Biblical quotations." (P. 186.) (*Luther I.*)

"We must admit without reserve that it does not show us the picture of a man who is morally bankrupt. The author does not make the impression of one bent on sensuality and seeking the means of gratifying it. The work, on the contrary, breathes a spiritual tendency, even to the point of excess, though not, indeed, without a strong admixture of the earthly element.

"The vivacity and fertility of thought which the author displays is noteworthy; the personal coloring in which he depicts his religious ideas . . . is unique and of priceless value to the biographer." (Page 241.)

"We find much that is excellent and calculated to elucidate the Pauline text." (P. 242.) "His own linguistic training and his knowledge of ancient literature were of great service to him, as also his natural quickness of judgment combined with sagacity." (P. 243.)

"To his words the University was even then attentive." (P. 244.) "He knew well how to hold his listeners by the versatility of his spirit and his ability to handle words. His language comprises, now weighty sentences, now popular and striking comparisons. He speaks, when he is so inclined, in the popular and forcible style he employs at a later date; he borrows from the lips of the populace sayings of unexampled coarseness with which he spices his harangues, more especially with a view to emphasizing his attitude to his opponents." (P. 244.) "Interesting picture of his inmost thoughts." (P. 259.) "A real genius and a man of originality." (P. 301.) "His capacity for work was enormous." (P. 274.) "His powers of work were indeed amazing." (P. 275.) "He became so thin that one could count his ribs, as the saying is." (P. 279.)

"Luther's strange eyes, with their pensive gleam, ever ready to smile on a friend, and, in fact, his whole presence, made an impression upon all who were brought into close contact with him. It is an undoubted fact, true even of his later days, that intercourse with him was pleasant. Not only were his pupils devoted admirers of the brave critic of the Schoolmen, but, little by little,

he also gained an unquestioned authority over the other professors." (P. 86.) "The seduction exercised by his splendid talents." (P. 301.)

"Only Luther's strange power over men can account for the fact that so many of the monks were convinced that he was animated by the true Spirit of God. . . . Staupitz himself . . . often said to him: 'Christ speaks through you.' (P. 298.) 'I praise Christ in you, and I am forced to believe Him in you.'" (P. 305.)

Grisar quotes Melancthon: "In the opinion of the wise and pious the light of the new teaching first broke forth, after a long and dark night, in the commentary on these Epistles — Romans and Galatians, 1515 and 1516. There Luther pointed out the true distinction between the law and the gospel; there he refuted the Pharisaical errors which then ruled in the schools and in the pulpits, namely, that man was able to obtain forgiveness of sin by his own efforts and could be justified before God by the performance of outward works. He brought back souls to the Son of God, he pointed to the Lamb, who bore the guilt of our sins. He demonstrated that sin was forgiven for the sake of the Son of God and that such a favor ought to be accepted in faith. He also shed a great light on the other articles of faith." *Vita Lutheri*, p. 6. (P. 303.)

Grisar quotes Mathesius: "Dr. Luther in all his lectures and disputations chiefly treats of this question and article, whether the true faith by which we are to live a Christian faith and die a happy death is to be learned from Holy Scripture or from the godless heathen Aristotle, on whom the Doctors of the Schools attempted to base the doctrine of the Romish Church and of the monks. . . . This is the chief issue between Dr. Luther and the Sophists. . . . He insisted upon this in his writings and disputations before ever he began his controversy on Indulgences. For this reason he was at the time scolded as a heretic." (Pp. 303-304.)

In 1516 Luther put out his *Seven Penitential Psalms*. Justus Jonas wrote: "I confess that I owe you my life for your Psalter. I pray and conjure you for Christ's sake to neglect no opportunity to write to us."

Himself a master of German, he yet confessed: "Compared with him (Luther) we creep and stammer: he walks in erect as

into an open sea and has the ocean, both of words and matter, out of which we drip droplets and are happy with the little dippers: he can do all things alone what all of us together cannot do or accomplish." He likened Luther to Elijah who drove the horses and chariot of Israel. 2 Kings 2, 12.

In a disputation on September 4, 1516, Luther dethroned Aristotle and enthroned Christ in theology. Erfurt, Leipzig, and even Luther's own colleagues were angered, but Carlstadt, and Amsdorf, and Schurf were convinced and came over to his side.

Was Luther right in his fight on Aristotle? Professor John A. O'Brien of Notre Dame writes: "Scholasticism had degenerated into a finical, hair-splitting manner of treating theological questions." *The Reformation*, p. 19.

Christopher Scheurl wrote Luther's old teacher Jodocus Truttvetter at Erfurt, "Soon it will be possible to become a theologian without either Aristotle or Plato."

To John Eck of Ingolstadt on January 14, 1517: "Among the theologians at Wittenberg the most eminent is Martin Luther, the Augustinian, who expounds the epistles of Paul with marvellous genius."

Grisar: "Humanist lawyer Christopher Scheurl of Nuernberg on September 11, 1517, wrote Luther he wished 'the theology of Christ may be reinstated and that we may walk in His law'." (P. 313.)

Jean Marie Vincent Audin in his *Luther*: "The monks then ruled the schools, under the shadow of Aristotle: a revolution was required to overthrow their dynasty. . . . They found themselves opposed to an adversary who had himself been educated in the schools, a monk also, who required no inspiration of wit from the ancients, but whose ridicule was impassioned and fiery . . . and who was the first to introduce into theological controversy warmth, eloquence, intemperate and coarse language. . . . Luther's ax was too weighty for them to wield.

"A few words dropped from an obscure chair, by a professor who had not even wherewith to cover himself in winter, excited the Catholic world . . . in Latin, of which he was absolute master."

Kaiser Max heard Geiler of Kaisersberg preach: "Since bishop, kaiser, and king do not reform our unspiritual, corrupt,

and godless life, God will awake one who will again raise up the fallen religion."

The Rev. John A. O'Brien, Ph. D., of the University of Notre Dame: "Pope Pius II forbade in his bull 'Execrabilis' all appeals to a future council. Gregory of Heimburg publicly charged him with issuing the bull so that he and his cardinals could conveniently pillage Germany unhampered by the threat of a council. 'By forbidding appeals to a council, the pope treats us like slaves, and wishes to take for his own pleasures all that we and our ancestors have accumulated by honest labor.'

"Albert of Brandenburg was Archbishop of Magdeburg, Administrator of Halberstadt, and later acquired also the Archbishopric of Mayence, by paying 14,000 ducats for the papal confirmation, and 10,000 as a 'composition' for permission to hold, against the Canons of the Church, his two previously acquired Archbishoprics. This scandalous deal with Pope Leo X brings out one of the besetting evils of the day, the evil of Pluralities.

"Because Albert of Brandenburg, Archbishop of Mayence, was in debt over a transaction indistinguishable from simony, Leo allowed him to retain half the proceeds from the preaching of indulgences. This was a disgraceful deal on the part of both.

"A further abuse arose from the practice of secular rulers in forbidding the promulgation of indulgences in their territories, except on condition that they shared in the amount collected." — *The Reformation*, pp. 20. 21. 22. The Paulist Press, N. Y. 1943.

"The trade in pardons, otherwise called 'indulgences,' was a public scandal. The facts are indisputable. . . . For more than two hundred years the pardoner of *Piers Plowman* and Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, had been enjoying himself at the expense of simple people." — P. 6, *The Prot. Ref. in Gt. B.* by Joseph Clayton, F. R. Hist. S. Bruce, Milwaukee, 1934. "To paganism rather than to Protestantism was the inclination of clergy and laity in Italy, when religious fervor was lost in the Renaissance." P. 21.

What is an indulgence? "Whenever it happened that any rogue of Newgate was condemned to be hanged, Peter would offer him a pardon for a certain sum of money, which when the poor caitiff had made all shifts to scrape up, and send, his lordship would return a piece of paper in this form:

'To all mayors, sheriffs, jailors, constables, bailiffs, hangmen, etc. Whereas we are informed that A. B. remains in the hands of you, or some of you, under the sentence of death, we will and command you, upon sight hereof, to let the said prisoner depart to his own habitation, whether he stands condemned for murder, sodomy, rape, sacrilege, incest, treason, blasphemy, etc.; for which this shall be your sufficient warrant; and if you fail hereof, God damn you and yours to all eternity. And so we bid you heartily farewell.

Your most humble man's man,
Emperor Peter.'

The wretches, trusting to this, lost their lives and money too."

This is an indulgence letter written by "Terrible Dean" Jonathan Swift in his *Tale of a Tub*. Lawyer William Samuel Lilly, Secretary of the Catholic Union of Great Britain, in his *Renaissance Types* admits this letter "with inimitable irony represents, with substantial accuracy, the view taken of it by the ignorant and superstitious peasantry to whom it chiefly appealed.

"What he thought he was buying was forgiveness of his past sins, and at the same time liberty to commit more. To the crowds who flocked to the indulgence fairs the message practically was that St. Peter, for hard cash, would open and guarantee heaven." — *Renaissance Types*, p. 255.

The Catholic Prof. Dr. Ludwig Pastor says the indulgence was "degraded into a merely financial transaction. The need of money instead of the good of souls became only too often the end of the indulgence. . . . Neither religious nor secular clergy shrank from the direct sale of spiritual gifts, and gave absolution for money to those who did not even profess to have contrition. . . . Eck reported that 'permissory letters' were given as the actual reward of crime. . . . Cardinal Canisio was of opinion that the facilities for absolution encouraged sinners and were inducement to sin. . . . There is no doubt that Tetzels doctrine was virtually that of the drastic proverb: 'As soon as money in the coffer rings, the soul from purgatory's fire springs'." — *History of the Popes*, Vol. VII, pp. 338-349. Herder, St. Louis, Mo.

About 1450 Gascoigne, Chancellor of Oxford, wrote: "Sinners now say, 'I care not how many or how great sins I commit

in God's sight, for I can, with all ease and dispatch obtain a plenary remission from any penalty or guilt whatsoever through an absolution and indulgence granted me by the Pope, whose writing and grant I bought for sixpence." Claude d' Espence, Rector of the Sorbonne, spoke at the Council of Trent: "For certain sums of money all crimes are permitted. Rome sells her absolution for every sin and for the most monstrous misdeeds. I dare not even mention their names." Archbishop Conrad of Usberg said at the same time: "All men are subservient to thee (Rome), knowing that so they may commit every crime and get absolution for a little gold." — Constantine Labarum, pp. 153, 154.

Benito Mussolini in his *John Hus* quotes von Bezold's "History of the Reformation": "With money one could buy anything . . . from the smallest prebend to the cardinal's cap, and from permission to use butter on fast-days even to absolution for murder and incest."

Elector Archbishop Albrecht of Mainz gave instructions to Tetzel in which is a price list of indulgences: "Kings and their families, bishops, etc., 25 Rhenish gold guilders; abbots, counts, barons, etc., 10; lesser nobles and ecclesiastics and others with incomes of 500, 6 guilders; citizens with their own income, 1 guilder; those with less, $\frac{1}{2}$." — Bettenson *Documents*, p. 258.

With this world's most scandalous racket Tetzel gypped the money of the people and also periled the souls of Luther's flock.

Luther was not a hireling that saw the thief coming and fled. This good shepherd was willing to lay down his life for the sheep. On October 31, 1517, Luther posted ninety-five theses to debate indulgences.

Sylvester Prierias, the Holy Father's confessor and master of the papal palace, gave a report on the Theses. It is not exactly in praise of Luther, but it is so informing as to the atmosphere about the God on earth that we insert it.

It was pure Catholic teaching that the soul flies to heaven the moment the coin clinks in the chest.

He even defended Tetzel's alleged statement his indulgence would forgive a man even if he had violated the Holy Mother of God. As a good cook Tetzel had only added to wholesome food the stimulating spice!

Whosoever is not imbued with the teaching of the Roman Church and the Roman Pontiff, as the infallible rule of faith, from which even Holy Scripture draws its authority, is a heretic.

The Pope is infallible, his kingdom is that of the Son of Man; he is not only the ruler of the whole world, but he is virtually the whole world, the world-soul, who could make and unmake emperors at will, and he quoted a passage from the Decretals: "If the Pope were so wicked as to lead souls in crowds to the devil, still no one could depose the Pope."

For an argument he uses this: He suspects Luther's father was a dog, for biting was the habit of dogs; he calls Luther a leper with a nose of iron, a head of brass, etc., etc.

Query: Who was the first to use rough language?

"I hoped the Pope would protect me, for I had so fortified my theses with proofs from the Bible and papal decretals that I was sure he would condemn Tetzel and bless me. But when I expected a benediction from Rome, there came thunder and lightning instead, and I was treated like the sheep that had roiled the wolf's water. Tetzel went scotfree, and I must submit to be devoured."

French Catholic historian Jean Marie Vincent Audin writes of the theological censor: "The constant guest of Lorenzo de Medici; the friend, patron, and intimate companion of the artists who were resident at Florence; a polished and elegant man, — he did not in his controversy with Luther employ that vicious style for which some of the Augustinian's adversaries may justly be censured. His language was always calm, ornate, perhaps too carefully elaborated . . .

Prierias, who had spent his advanced life in that Rome where nations and kings exhausted themselves in flattering Leo X, saw nothing but the papacy in the question stirred by Luther. An ancient remnant of the court of the Medicis, in which his infancy had been reared, he could not bear that Luther should have thought of meddling with the tiara of his benefactor Leo."

Yet Audin seems to be a bit ashamed of his hero: "One sees, in reading it, that he was under the influence of that fascination which the pope exercised over all minds. It is certain that his veneration for the papacy approaches to worship. We must not make his enthusiasm a reproach; there is something chivalrous in

the devotedness of this grey-haired man, who had but a few days to live, and who, broken, worn out, and ill as he was, came to the contest with one of thirty years. The views of Prierias, in regard to the power of the Keys, were ultramontane, like those of all the schools at this period." — *Luther* I, 110. 111.

"Erasmus did not overlook some expressions of Prierias; he laughed at them, and cracked his jokes at the expense of the Dominican." P. 111.

Tetzel attacked Luther and hinted at burning him for a heretic. Later Karl von Miltitz, the pope's chamberlain, at Leipzig blamed Tetzel for being the cause of all the trouble and scorned him for his graft and immorality so fiercely that he had to take to his bed, and died.

Dean Albert Krantz of Hamburg said: "You speak the truth, good brother, but you'll not do anything. Back to your cell and pray, 'God have mercy upon me!'"

Dr. Fleck, preaching at the dedication of the University, foretold Wittenberg would be the berg of wit, wisdom, and life — *vitae*. Now the Prior of Steinlausig told his Franciscans, "There is a man who will do it!" And he heartened Luther, "Venerable Doctor, proceed! Press forward! These papal abuses always displeased me, too, etc."

Staunch Catholic Duke George of Saxony suggested to his Bishop of Merseburg to post Luther's theses in many places to warn the poor people against Tetzel's doings, cheating them out of their soul's salvation.

Prince Adolf von Anhalt, Bishop of Merseburg, expressed his joy to the Saxon Councilor Pflug that the poor people were warned against Tetzel's fraud.

Bishop Schulz, Scultetus, of Brandenburg at Berlin, inspector of Luther's university, found the Theses "good Catholic" and in 1518 gave him leave to print the "Resolutions on the Theses."

"Albrecht Duerer alone can dispute with Leonardo da Vinci the palm of universal genius. Though a great painter, this was one of the least of his accomplishments," wrote Melanchthon. "He established the art of scientific principles, perfecting the knowledge of linear perspective, and as a student of anatomy was the rival of Michelangelo, he excelled in arts never attempted by Leonardo,

engraving and etching, if not the inventor of etching, he was the first to bring it near to perfection. He discovered and practiced the method of engraving in two colors and thus laid the foundation for the modern art of chromo-lithography. In writing he might have dethroned Erasmus and become the first man of letters." This "universal genius" denounced "the un-Christian Papacy which strives against the freedom of Christ" and puts on the laity such "heavy burdens of human laws for which we are robbed of the price of our blood and sweat that it may be spent shamefully by idle, lascivious people, while thirsty and sick men perish of hunger, the blind teaching which the men, whom they call the Fathers, have invented and set down whereby the precious Word is in many places falsely explained, or not set forth at all."

He read Luther's Ninety-five Theses and thankfully sent the total stranger some woodcut books and etchings.

Michael Ignaz Schmidt, not friendly to Luther, imperial councillor and member of the college of censors at Vienna under Joseph II, 1794, "That he took things in hand where the rest mainly spoke pious wishes, honors his characteristic fearlessness as well as his zeal for the good cause."

In his "Modern History of the Germans": "Rome broke its promise and for that was punished." The tricks of most (Indulgence) preachers and money collectors, used for that, outdid everything the lowest class of quacks ever concocted to palm off their wares on the people. One would hardly believe it was possible, did not the matter lie before the eye proved by incontestable documents. One must observe that hardly one or the other of the 95 theses is found which was not asserted by one or more respected theologians before Luther without being denounced as heretics. . . . Luther showed himself in these Theses really as a thinking head and a man of great courage."

Franz Xaver Kraus of Freiburg, 1901. "The infidelity of the humanists and the corruption of morals dared camp upon the steps of the papal chair . . . had to lead to an explosion. . . ."

"The 95 Theses of October 31, 1517, were not bolder than the assertions of many earlier zealots, but the tension had reached the uttermost degree, the situation was ripe for a crisis, and Martin Luther was the man to master it. In him the nation with

its complaints and demands, found a speaker combining spirit, strength, and boldness, in the grandest manner; to whom it surrendered, in whom it saw its innermost self embodied — the most popular and most powerful man of the people arisen since centuries in the Church.” — *Textbook of Church History*. 3 vol., p. 441.

Grisar: “It was clear that all the currents adverse to the Papacy were, so to speak, waiting for the coming of one man, who should unchain them with his powerful hand. . . . Luther found combustible material — social, moral, and political — heaped up so high that a stunning result was not surprising.

“Luther arrived on the scene with his terrible, mighty voice, pressed all the elements of the storm into his service, and, launching a defiance of which the world had never before heard the like, succeeded in winning an immense success for the standard he had raised.” (P. 56.)

“Duke George, who was zealous for reform, was much in favor of Luther’s Indulgence Theses.” (P. 379.)

Lawyer William Samuel Lilly, Secretary of the Catholic Union of Great Britain, says in his *Renaissance Types*: “Tetzel’s preaching of the indulgence . . . was the immediate occasion of the greatest ecclesiastical revolution in the Christian era. . . . I see no reason whatever for doubting the truth of the statement that Luther’s attention was called to Tetzel’s performances by penitents of his own, who advanced against his authority in the confessional documents which they had obtained from that pardoner. He thought it his duty to say a word of warning to his congregation. He desired reform. He did not contemplate revolution.

“Earnestly religious he undoubtedly was. There can be no question that the sense of mission was strong in Luther. His sincerity, from first to last, seems open to no doubt. Of the depth and earnestness of his religious convictions there can be no doubt whatever in any mind not hopelessly warped by polemical prejudice. No one can carefully examine those ninety-five theses of Luther’s without being struck by their moderation. Earlier theologians had attacked the whole theory of indulgences in much sharper and bitterer tones. The church authorities were of those whose eyes the god of this world had blinded.”

Erasmus, monk and priest, friend of the Kaiser, of four kings, and of four popes, rated by his biographer Professor Drummond and by Henry C. Vedder of Crozer Baptist Theological Seminary "the greatest scholar of the world," sent Luther's Ninety-five Theses with favorable comments on March 5, 1518, to Dean John Colet of St. Paul's and to Sir Thomas More. Thus began what Cardinal Gasquet styles "the Lutheran invasion of England."

Clayton admits: "The sale of indulgences or pardons in Germany had become a public scandal. . . . There was nothing in the publication of the Ninety-five Theses to astonish or distress the faithful . . . and there was much the faithful could entirely appreciate. . . . The first move on the whole was decidedly popular. . . . By the end of the year Luther's criticism of indulgences had won sympathetic attention all over Germany." *Luther*, pp. 42, 43, 54.

Kaspar Ruef, LL. D., professor of the Catholic Roman Civil Law at Freiburg im Breisgau, not friendly to Luther, judges of the Ninety-five Theses: "Luther asserted nothing but what many orthodox theologians long before him had asserted; and many of them are very wholesome and telling admonitions which the Lord Pope might very well have taken to heart; they are truths which today every Catholic can sign without scruple." And then he points to 82, 86, 90, 92. . . . "On September 13, 1518, the first bull of the pope was published in which under threat of excommunication he commanded to believe: 'There is in the Roman church a tradition that the living as well as the dead according to the measure of the granted and acquired indulgence are freed from every temporal punishment *they owe to the divine justice!*' (What a brazen lie, ex cathedra!)

"In 1520 Pope Leo issued a second bull against Luther, threatens, damns, curses. In 1522 the German nation sent *Hundred Grievances* to Rome, and complained bitterly about the lamentable consequences of the indulgence, the loss of German money, and the corruption of German morals. Such things create no great sensation at Rome. But when the infallibility and supreme power is attacked, or a Roman Catholic article of faith is questioned, then the whole Roman curia goes into convulsive

motions." — *Review of Wiegand Kamper's "History of Indulgence."* 1787.

Paolo Sarpi, "the greatest Venetian," famous historian of the Council of Trent, Servite monk: "The indulgence preachers squandered in the taverns what the people had saved on their daily bread in order to buy the indulgence. Through this, Martin Luther, an Augustinian monk, was moved to preach against such money collectors."

W. Winterer translated Paolo Sarpi's four volume *History of the Council of Trent* and says it was written against the abuses general at the time and still in part. "In this sense I consider the Reformation in the 16th century a great luck for my religion, the Catholic faith, because this had to cleanse itself in the battle, and still must, and must in future."

Editor Alfred v. Martin of the *Catholic Hochland* of October, 1917, says not only men of cool religiosity like Erasmus and Crotus Rubianus, but also truly religious spirits like Wimpfeling and Cochlaeus, who later left no good hair on Luther, have acknowledged his noble motives.

The same *Hochland* holds, "Today every Catholic can agree with Luther's Ninety-five Theses."

Luther's case was to come up at the convention of the Augustinians at Heidelberg in April, 1518.

Count Albrecht of Mansfeld warned Martin not to go, some great ones would hang or drown him.

Prince-Bishop Lorenz von Bibra of Würzburg invited him to his Castle Marienburg, towering high above the city. He was so pleased with his guest that he wrote Elector Frederick to stand by the godly man, for they do him injustice.

"You have, by Jove! a stunning letter of introduction from your Prince," said James Simler, and so Prince Wolfgang entertained the monk at court, and showed him the splendors and wonders of the famous castle; and Martin was as happy as a school-boy on a vacation.

In a public debate Luther defended his teaching before the faculty of the University of Heidelberg and his own former teacher Usingen "so cleverly, that he made no little fame for Your Love's university. And great praise was given him by many learned

men," Prince Wolfgang wrote the Elector Frederick. (P. 119, 99. 100.) And if Frederick liked one thing better than another, it was to hear the praises of his darling university.

Young Dominican Martin Bucer on May 1, wrote his friend Beatus Rhenanus: "No matter how much our champions tried to unhorse Luther, they could not win a finger's breadth from him. Wonderful is his grace in responding, incomparable his patience in listening. His keenness reminds one of the manner of the Apostle Paul. With his short and telling answers taken from the store of Holy Writ he compels all to admiration. The next day I had a private, confidential interview with him and then shared his meal, meager but spiced with precious talk. Whatever I might ask, he knew how to explain to me everything most clearly. With Erasmus he agrees fully, but he surpasses him in so far as he says freely and frankly at what the other only hints. O that I could only write you still more! He it was that at Wittenberg ended the reign of scholasticism and brought it about that Greek, Jerome, Augustine, and Paul are taught publicly there."

John Brenz and Theodore Billicanus and Erhard Schnepf were impressed by Luther, had an interview with him, and next year came over to his side.

Luther left in a wagon — order of Staupitz.

Grisar: The disputations gave Luther "a good opportunity for displaying his fiery temper, his quick-wittedness, his talent as an orator, his general knowledge, and particularly his familiarity with the Bible." (P. 314.)

The Heidelberg Disputation "was a victory for the new teaching." (P. 298.) "The astounding and evergrowing applause of those who were otherwise loyal to the Church." (P. 332.)

On his way home from the Heidelberg Disputation, Luther preached before the court at Dresden on July 25, 1518, from Matthew 20: 22, the Gospel for the Feast of James the Greater. At dinner Barbara van Sala praised the sermon as most reassuring, and added that if she could hear such a sermon again she would die with a quiet mind.

Duke George replied: "I would have given much money not to have heard it, because such discourses make men presumptuous."

This he repeated several times at table with great displeasure. (Pages 369-370.)

Erasmus dithyrambs about Melanchthon: "Immortal God, what hope is this young man! Yes, this boy! What keenness of phantasy, what purity of language, what beauty of expression, what memory for unknown things, what knowledge of the ancient literatures, what mature reading!" This prodigy came to Wittenberg in 1518 and at once made Luther his "spiritual father in Christ Jesus." "If there is anything on earth that I love, it is the studies of Martin and his pious writings, but above everything else, I love Martin himself."

Of the "*Sermon on Good Works*," "No writer ever came nearer St. Paul than Luther has done." The "Galatians" he called "Theseus' clue to the maze of Biblical science."

"Never was there a greater man on the face of the earth. I would rather die than separate myself from this man."

"Luther is too great, too wonderful for me to depict in words. If there be a man on earth whom I love with my whole heart, that man is Luther. One is an interpreter; another a logician; still another an orator, copious and beautiful in speech; but Luther is all — whatever he writes, whatever he utters, pierces to the soul, fixes itself like arrows in the heart — he is a miracle among men."

In 1521 he wrote Th. Placentinus: "If I defend Luther, it is done because he again brought to light the Gospel. Luther never thought of disturbing the peace of the Church, disrupting the Christian unity, inciting uprising in the Reich. Not he is the author of the strife now broken out, the opponents are the ones, who would suppress the truth; they seek not the peace of the Church, but only the violent exercise of their tyrannical power. . . . Luther has no other purpose but to lead men back to the Gospel; take this in hand, let Luther be Luther, do not listen to him, but to the divine Word, then you will yourselves know the Christian truth and see how Romanism opposes it."

Luther was ordered to go to Augsburg to be tried by papal legate Cardinal Cajetan. Staupitz said to Luther: "What consoles me is that the doctrine which we teach has restored all glory

to God and given none to man; the delight of my heart is that the Gospel denies to man all wisdom and justice."

He wrote him in September, 1518: "It seems to me that the world is exasperated against Truth; with so great a hatred was Christ once crucified, and today I see nothing waiting for you but the Cross. Unless I mistake, the opinion prevails that no one should examine Scripture without leave of the Pope in order to find for himself, which Christ certainly commands us to do. You have a few defenders, and would that they were not hiding for fear of enemies. I should like you to leave Wittenberg and come to me, that we may live and die together. That would also please the archbishop Lang of Salzburg."

Jesuit Grisar on Luther's way to Cajetan: "To attribute hypocrisy to him, as though he merely played a part, would be to do him an injustice. It is true there are recent writers who look upon him as a mere comedian, but it would be nearer the mark to compare him to John Hus on his journey to the Council of Constance. Like him, he looked forward to death without any inclination to recant." (P. 356.)

"The Light of the Church," according to Pope Clement VII, ordered the poor monk in a borrowed gown to recant. Certainly, as soon as you show I'm wrong. The learned Cajetan answered: 'Pope Clement VI in the bull *Unigenitus* expressly declared the merits of Christ were the treasure of indulgences,' and the Pope's word settled the question. 'Ten times almost I tried to put in my word. Ten times he thundered me down.' At last Luther cried louder than the delegate he would recant if Pope Clement had really declared the merits of Christ to be the treasure of indulgence. 'Heavens! what gesticulating and joyful chuckling!' The legate gets the book and exultingly reads: Christ by the merits of His Passion acquired the treasure of indulgence.

"Ha! most reverend Father, stop a bit. If Christ by the merits of His Passion *acquired* the treasure, then the merits cannot *be* the treasure!"

"The legate was stunned; he tried to hide his confusion by trying to change the subject. But Luther would not let him skip, he pinned him down to the point. With frank humor he says he replied in a tone certainly irreverent enough, 'Your

most reverend Paternity must not suppose that, Germans though we be, we are ignorant of grammar. It is one thing to *be* a treasure and another to *acquire* a treasure.' 'Get out, and never return unless to recant.' Recant he would not, so return he could not.

"The legate did not wish to see Luther, who had profound eyes and wonderful speculations in his head."

Canon Conrad Adelman of Augsburg to Spalatin on October 18, 1518: "Welcome to us was the opportunity of seeing and speaking to dear Dr. Martin Luther, so well endowed with both virtue and learning. We often visited him, as one we heartily love, and showed him our good will. . . . I will not conceal from you that Dr. Luther acquitted himself before the legate as becometh a Christian man. . . . If anyone came with good reasons and arguments from Scripture he would abandon his opinion and embrace a better one."

Lawyer Christopher Scheurl at Nürnberg wrote Spalatin on October 21: "The favor of all for Luther is wonderful."

Luther wrote Carlstadt on October 14: "Christopher Langemantel, a canon and imperial councilor, is so faithful to me that I am ashamed of his great care for me. I have the favor and support of all men except the crowd who hold with the cardinal. . . . I won't make myself a heretic by contradicting the opinion which made me a Christian. I will die first by fire, or be exiled and cursed."

This Christopher Langemantel on the night of October 20 opened a gate in the city wall and furnished a horse which Luther mounted only in shorts and socks, without spurs and weapons and rode off to safety. At Monheim he got off his hard trotting nag and sank into the straw like dead.

On November 25 the queer horseman wrote Langemantel: "The offices of extraordinary humanity and kindness with which you overwhelmed my unworthy self, have made your name and fame a pleasant and sweet savor to us. . . . If they kill me, they will cease pursuing a dead flea." (1 Sam. 24, 14.)

Anglo-Catholic James B. Mozley of Oxford, far from friendly to Luther, admits: "Luther said Christ *acquired* a treasure by His merits, therefore *they are* not the treasure. Cajetan had com-

mitted a mistake and did not regain his position. The issue of the conference was a disappointment at Rome. The fault was thrown upon Cajetan's stiffness and asperity" — as Luther also stated.

In a letter to Carlstadt on October 14, 1518, Luther opined: "Perchance he is a fine Thomist, but a puzzle-headed, obscure, senseless theologian and Christian as well fitted to deal with and judge this business as an ass to play the harp." Was Luther prejudiced? The able Cardinal Campeggi blamed Cardinal Cajetan for the failure at Augsburg, and so did the magnificent Cardinal Wolsey. When Campeggi was in London in the case of Henry's divorce he reported to Lanza at Rome Wolsey had repeatedly said to him: "As one cardinal (Cajetan) had lost Germany to the pope, beware lest another cardinal (Campeggi) lose England to the pope."

Speaking of Albrecht Durer, Lazarus Spengler, and other celebrated lights of Nürnberg, Scheurl remarked: "Nearly all the conversation at table concerns a certain Martin. Him they celebrate, adore, champion. For him they are prepared to endure everything." And to Eck: "The clergy's love for the man is astonishing. They are flying to him in flocks. They subscribe to his opinions, they applaud him, they bless him."

Papal chamberlain Saxon Karl von Miltitz came with the much coveted Golden Rose to bribe the Elector to send "the child of Satan and son of perdition" in chains to Rome. He had no less than seventy "Apostolic Letters" from the Pope to princes and prelates to arrest Luther, or pass him through their lands to Rome.

The noble Saxon chamberlain soon sensed a change in the sentiment of the people. He found three out of four for Luther and an army of twenty-five thousand not strong enough to lug Luther to Rome.

Miltitz cited Tetzl to Altenburg. Tetzl begged to be excused from leaving Leipzig for fear of death at the hands of the people. One short year after Luther's Theses, Tetzl had to quit the indulgence business, though the eight-year-lease still had five years to run. Luther had killed "the Holy Business"; "Othello's occupation's gone."

At Leipzig, Miltitz fiercely denounced the abandoned pardon vendor in the fiercest manner. When the cowed Tetzl was cowering in his convent, and everybody was roundly cursing him for causing all the trouble, it was the noble-minded, big-hearted, whole-souled Luther who wrote the neglected, broken-hearted, dying man a letter of cheer and comfort, telling him he was not to blame, but the man higher up; "the child has an altogether different father."

1519 Miltitz embraced, kissed, and dined "the child of Satan and son of perdition." He fiercely denounced the shameless indulgence hucksters and spoke flatteringly of Luther's person and great influence. Within a hundred years there had not been a case that had so worried the crowd of loafing cardinals and Rome-worshipping Romanists, and they would rather give 10,000 ducats than let this affair go on. On his too optimistic report to Rome, the pope invited his "dear Son" Luther to Rome to recant, and even offered money for the journey, and Cajetan had been too rough with him.

The elector's councilor Pfeffinger was with Miltitz at Nürnberg and was sure Martin might have any dignity he wished, if he would only recant, as Scheurl informed him on December 20.

Papal Legate Orsini on June 21 told Elector Frederick if he favored the pope's policy at the coming election of a kaiser, he could have a cardinal's hat and a "splendid archbishopric" for anyone he would name — Luther! At Worms the Elector told this to some princes.

Grisar: "In the matter of style, Luther was more successful in his shorter works, particularly in his German controversial pamphlets. Writers who opposed him, such as Eck, Emser, Dungsheim, Alveld, Hoogstraaten, Prierias, he readily withstood in words full of fire and imagination." (P. 366.)

Luther wrote Spalatin on February 24, 1519:

"I do not care if even my friends say I have lost my reason; it must be so; I have awaited this hour when they should be offended in me, as the disciples and friends of Christ were in Christ. Matthew 26: 31; Mark 14: 27; truth must stand by its divine strength, not by mine or yours or that of any man." (Pp. 402-403.)

"In Luther's case there is no reason for assuming any 'monkish mental disease,' nor can he be proved to have suffered from any disturbance whatever of his mental functions at any time of his life." (P. 383.)

Wenceslaus Link found in Luther his "father and preceptor." He left Wittenberg in 1516 for Nürnberg and soon preached the Gospel according to St. Martin and made the Augustinian cloister one of the earliest nurseries of Lutheranism.

At Nürnberg lawyer Christoph Scheurl in 1516 corresponded with Luther whose cause was the "cause of God." On February 18, 1519, he wrote Eck all the most spiritually minded clergymen were devoted to Luther, "they flew to him in dense troops like starlings," and confessed their holiest desires were prompted by his writings. Caspar Nuetzel, one of the most dignified officials of the city, held it an honor to put the Ninety-five Theses into German.

Eobanus Hessus, crowned "poet-king" of Germany, abandoned his Horace for the Holy Scriptures; Jodocus Koch of Nördlingen, Justus Jonas, forsook classical Greek for the Epistles to the Corinthians; the wicked satirist, Curicius Cordus, betook himself to the New Testament. They did this out of admiration of Erasmus, "their father in Christ," but when Luther appeared, they came under his spell. Many Erasmici became Martiniani.

The Ebners and the Nuetzlers celebrated their daughters taking the veil, and at the same time celebrated Luther and his writings.

Duerer wrote Spalatin, "God grant that I may meet with Dr. Martin Luther, for I will then make a careful sketch of him and engrave it on copper, so that the memory of that Christian may long be preserved, for he has helped me out of much anxiety."

Erasmus Alois Marlian, Bishop of Tuy in Galicia, on March 20, 1519: "They would devour Luther offhand. They may eat him boiled or roast, for all that I care. . . . Luther ought to be answered and not crushed. . . . Piety requires that we should at times conceal the truth. . . . Perhaps we must admit with Plato that lies are useful to the people. . . . No one believes how deeply Luther has crept into the minds of many nations nor how widely

his books have been translated into every tongue and scattered everywhere."

To Justus Jonas on April 9: "I would not have the Dominicans know what a friend I am to Luther."

To the Elector Frederick on April 14, 1519: "Every one who knows the man approves of his life, since he is as far as possible from suspicion of avarice or ambition; and blameless morals find favor even among heathen. All those who attack him do it with ferocity, raging against him, but neither warning nor teaching him, as though they thirsted for blood rather than the salvation of souls. May the Duke prevent an innocent man from being surrendered under the cloak of piety to the impiety of a few!"

To Cardinal Albrecht in 1519: "Whoever is a decent sort of man does not take the least offense at Luther's writings. . . . If he errs, I wish him bettered, not destroyed. . . . I see men, to whom above all mildness would be becoming, thirsting only for human blood, and striving to have Luther arrested and destroyed. But that is doing the work of a hangman, and not that of a theologian! Would they prove themselves great theologians, well, then let them convert the Christless to Christ, reform the public morals of the Christians, which are so corrupt that there is nothing more corrupt, not even among the Turks."

To Ulrich Zwingli: "It seems to me I have just about taught all Luther teaches, only not so violently and refraining from certain riddles and paradoxes."

Wolfgang Fabricius Capito gathered Luther's writings for the first edition printed by the famous Froben of Basel in October, 1518, and wrote in the foreword: "Here you have the theological works of the Reverend Father Martin Luther, whom many consider a Daniel sent at length in mercy by Christ to correct abuses and restore the evangelic and Pauline divinity to theologians who have forgotten the ancient commentaries and occupy themselves with the merest logical and verbal trifles. . . . May they no longer drag Christ to earth, as Thomas Aquinas always does, but may instruct the world in the teaching of Christ."

Froben wrote Luther on February 14, 1519, he had "at once reprinted Luther's complete works, as they were approved by all the learned. Six hundred copies have gone to France and Spain.

They are bought in Paris, read and approved at the Sorbonne. Bookdealer Francis Calvus of Pavia, a most learned man, devoted to the Muses, took a large number to Italy, to spread them all over in the cities. Nor does he do it so much for gain as to aid piety. I have also sent copies to England and Brabant. I have only 10 copies in stock. I have never had so much luck with a book. The abler one is, the more he is in love with you." He sold them in Switzerland, Italy, France, Holland, Spain, and England. He loved to tell they had been welcomed by Faber Stapulensis in France, how the Swiss Cardinal von Sitten had said Luther deserved all honor, for he spoke the truth, which no special pleading of an Eck could overthrow. WM. DALLMANN.

(Continued in next issue)

NEWS AND COMMENTS

† Rev. Otto Gerss † — On January 10 Rev. O. Gerss, P. em., who is known to our readers as the author of a series of articles on German church conditions, was called to his eternal rest. In the January, 1948, issue of our quarterly (p. 71) he had promised us a final article. His Lord willed otherwise. Although he still mustered enough strength to write us a letter expressing his regrets at not being able to fulfill his promise, his lingering illness finally led to his death at the age of 76 years. But the deceased was not only a contributor to the *Quartalschrift*, he was also a reader of our quarterly and took a great interest in the work and the confessional stand of our Synod. As one of the many refugees who had to flee from East Prussia, he and his wife finally found refuge in Herrlingen near Ulm and there were served by the Rev. G. Malschner, pastor of our Refugee Mission congregation in Memmingen, who officiated at his burial.

The Lutheran Free Church in Germany lost in the Rev. O. Gerss a pastor who excelled as a preacher, an essayist, and a polemist. As such he was an untiring advocate for all that the Lutheran Free Church in Germany stands for including purity of doctrine, separation of church and state, and an unwavering opposition to all unionistic endeavors. Consequently he was ever vigilant and wakeful over against all endeavors on the part of Lutheran church leaders in going beyond the bounds of Lutheran doctrine and practice. His knowledge of the practice of the Evangelical Church, to which he had belonged as pastor for 23 years, always aided him in detecting the doctrinal and ecclesiastical trends and

tendencies of the times. Apart from the experiences which he gathered in the years after World War I as a member of Evangelical church councils, of whose deliberations he often spoke when illustrating the lack of confessionalism in the Land churches, he had an exceptional gift of discerning the rise and growth of movements within and without the Church and in characterizing their effect on the life of the Christian. He was the first among the German theologians to answer our call for a critical review of the development of church affairs in the Germany after World War II. His series of three articles which appeared in 1947 and 1948 issues of the *Quartalschrift* (July and October, 1947; January, 1948) under the heading "*Die kirchliche Lage Deutschlands*", testifies to his uncompromising stand in doctrine and practice. Because of it he and his family had to experience the hatred and hostility of pastors of the Evangelical Church, from which he had separated in 1923 to found three mission-congregations in East Prussia, in Königsberg, Eydtkuhnen, and Lyck, and to join the Evangelical-Lutheran Free Church in 1929. "Whenever I am reminded of the conflicts," his widow writes, "which my husband had with the pastors of the Land churches and how we were ignored and slandered because of our joining the Free Church, and now we are to be drawn into them again — God forbid!" Let us not overlook the fact that even today one who in Germany leaves the Evangelical Church to join the Lutheran Free Church for confessional reasons exposes himself to attack and slander. The few men who recently have taken this step have experienced that church history is repeating itself. As a tribute to the deceased and as a word of encouragement to those who in loyalty to our Lutheran Confessions are severing connections with the Evangelical Church in Germany, we refer to something that the reader can gather best from the words of Rev. Gerss himself as they appear in the October, 1947, issue of our quarterly, page 290f. They bring a vivid picture of his staunch and unflinching confessionalism, his readiness to suffer for his conviction, the patience and understanding which he showed for those who were not yet ready to take the final and decisive step of separation, and the firmness with which he defended the taking of this step as the one way by which freedom of conscience is attained. — All these things make him at once a monument and an example.

P. PETERS.

Dr. Graebner and the Lutheran Witness. — A recent issue of the *Lutheran Witness* announces Dr. Th. Graebner's decision to withdraw from the active direction of this publication with which he has been identified for so many years. During the long editorship of Dr. Graebner (1914-1949) the *Lutheran Witness* has achieved the largest circulation of any religious periodical in the land. We are convinced that the major part of the credit belongs to the retiring editor. The many editorials and other

contributions that appeared over the familiar signature of "G." were not only brilliantly written but read widely, far beyond the confines of his own synod. It will be some time before it will be possible accurately to gauge the full measure of his influence.

Many will be wondering whether the retirement of Dr. Graebner will mark a change in the policy of the *Witness*. We do not expect it. There has, indeed, been one major change. Time was when the *Witness* was an outstanding exponent of conservative Lutheranism. Nowhere did one find a more searching criticism of the theology and the current activities of other Lutheran bodies, nowhere a more unsparing exposing of the errors which were thereby discovered, nowhere a sharper denunciation of unionism, particularly of the inter-Lutheran kind; nowhere was there a sterner application of the classical passages against unionism, particularly Romans 16:17 with its "avoid them." And the leading voice was that of "G." — as recent quotations in the *Confessional Lutheran* conclusively show.

How all this has changed in recent years, the years which may well go down as the "fateful forties" in the history of the Missouri Synod! The *Witness* became newsier. And the news came to be more and more of one color. Gone was the stern reproof with which the *Witness* of former years would have greeted many of these modern developments, in the intersynodical field as well as in that of congregational life. Nor would one gather from current issues of the *Witness* that there are today large groups of Missourians, pastors and congregations, who are thoroughly alarmed over this modern trend toward cooperation, who still call it unionism when this cooperation involves work of a spiritual nature, who are not ready to surrender the pertinent Scripture passages just because the group to which they should be applied happens to bear the name of "Lutheran." Although these groups of "Old Missourians" have also been quite active, their doings have seemingly had no "news value" for the *Witness*, — or they did not fit into the policy. Apparently the discovery that a strategic screening of news items together with a judicious emphasizing or de-emphasizing of the individual items will work wonders in the molding of public opinion is not limited to the secular press.

When we said above that we do not expect this policy of the *Witness* to change, we had in mind its issue of March 8, the same number in which the retirement of its chief editor was announced. Much of the material is by Dr. Graebner himself, including an article on the fiscal program of the synod which we consider one of the most effective financial appeals we have ever seen. The rest of the issue also shows that the Editor's "active direction of the *Lutheran Witness*" of which the announcement speaks is by no means an empty phrase. In this issue, particularly also in the article on the Fiscal Conference, appears almost the entire Graebner program. It is plainly there: the reference to a rapidly growing confessionalism among Lutherans, the decline and imminent death of Liberalism, the "brothering" of a Catholic Cardinal, a boost for cooperation in

Lutheran charities as a contribution toward the building of a unified Lutheran Church, an account of the cooperation of Lutheran Churches in Australia, another of a congenial meeting of Theological Faculties (apparently this one did discuss some of the differences), a report on the Building of a New Lutheranism in Great Britain (National Lutheran Council and Missouri) along N. L. C. lines, and so forth. And for the members of the synod: an appeal for loyalty toward the officials, an admonition to keep the peace in order that the program may not be hampered, and an anathema ("devil's own machinations") upon those who dare to dissent!

That is Dr. Graebner's policy, a policy which he is bequeathing to his successors, and which in turn they have dutifully endorsed and accepted. ("We . . . express our heartfelt gratitude to him for past guidance and association, and pledge our determination to perpetuate his policies and purposes for the *Lutheran Witness*.")

We still do not believe that this is what a large part of Missouri — the Old Missouri, the real Missouri — really wants. But it looks as though that is what it is going to get.

E. REIM.

A Voice From Bad Boll. — According to the *Lutheran Outlook* (February, 1949) one of the speakers at the Bad Boll Academy in Germany last summer was Dr. S. C. Michelfelder. The topic assigned to him was "The Significance of the Atom Bomb in the Spiritual Life of America." The text of his address is given in full by the *Outlook*. We do not envy him his topic, but even so we are surprised to find him saying: "Somehow, however, this sense of feeling that we are near to the source of all energy and power makes one feel he is right near the Almighty Himself. We have broken through another sealed gate. We have swept aside the angel with the flaming sword that was placed at the gate of Paradise when Adam and Eve were driven forth after they had sinned against God." A little later he says: "Can it be that we have come near the Tree of Life again; the source of all energy, the source of all light, the source of life itself?"

Dr. Michelfelder hails from the American Lutheran Church and is the Executive Secretary of the Lutheran World Federation. Undoubtedly his pronouncements at Bad Boll were considered as representing the best of American Lutheran theology. But what did the speaker mean? Did he wish to say that by engaging in atomic research man is once more treading on forbidden ground and thereby inviting another judgment of God? Or did he mean that the wrong lies only in the use which man has made of these new discoveries? Or was he praising the progress that science is making in its exploration of the unknown, and drawing the conclusion that thereby man is coming a step closer to his eventual recapture of the Paradise Lost?

We do not like to attribute this last thought to any Lutheran theologian, although the words seem to come perilously close to saying just that. Nor is the situation much better if we assume that the speaker was carrying out the first of these three thoughts. For there stand those words of Genesis by which God gave His express permission to man to subdue the earth. If (in the most charitable sense that we can discover) the wrong is to be restricted to the use which man has made of his new knowledge, then the words fail to say that.

No matter how we look at it, we feel that this pronouncement can hardly be considered one that promises to increase the prestige of American theology in Europe. Just what did the Doctor mean?

E. REIM.

The Cresset on the Mindszenty Trial. — So many people have rushed into print over the trial and condemnation of Cardinal Mindszenty that we were inclined to pass it by. It seemed as though almost everything possible had been said, — and some things that bordered on the impossible. Many statements were extreme, either giving complete approval to the sentencing of the Cardinal because he appears to be a representative of the Roman Catholic Church, or going all out for his defense because his accusers and judges are Communists. Neither of these views seems reasonable to us. Life just is not as simple as that. Add the fact that an intervening Iron Curtain makes it more than hard to get at all of the information, that such items which would perhaps be most necessary for the forming of an impartial opinion are simply not available, and then you have further reason for caution.

The Cresset seems to have no such inhibitions. In an editorial which is quoted with unreserved approval by "G." in the *Lutheran Witness* of March 8 ("here it is, and we agree with every word of it") the *Cresset* first lists some of the complicating factors, but then brushes them aside to say, "What matters to us is that he" (namely the Cardinal) "is a brother in the faith, even though he be an erring brother." And a little later he declares: "We use the word 'brother' in this instance to denote any man who acknowledges the lordship of Christ, whether he belongs to our branch of Christendom or to a branch which we have always believed to be seriously in error on a number of essential points."

How does the editor know that the Cardinal is a brother in the faith? "The foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are His" (2 Tim. 2:19). That is a knowledge to which our human mind has no access. But what we do know concerning this Hungarian prelate is that he is a member of the highest order of the Roman hierarchy, and that he stands before the world as defender of the soul-destroying errors of the Catholic Church. On what basis can the editor conclude that the Cardinal's acknowledgment of the lordship of Christ is not vitiated, perhaps mortally so, by the fact that this same man is a

devoted servant of Anti-Christ? Or has the papacy ceased to be "Anti-Christ" to these respectable editors?

Surely we can sympathize with a man who has become a victim of the inhuman and uncanny technique of the Soviets; we can express the conviction that this Roman prelate "was not arrested because he was a dangerous man, but because he was the spokesman of a dangerous institution — an institution of which, in the larger sense, we Lutherans and Baptists and Methodists and Presbyterians are members" — surely we can say all of these things without going to the length of pronouncing a man "*a brother in the faith.*" It will not take many such irresponsible statements to contribute materially to a further undermining of an already seriously weakened confessionalism in our ranks.

E. REIM.

Church and State in Hungary. — The best analysis of the conflict between church and state in the Hungary of today which has come to our attention, is that made by *Theology Today* in its April issue. As to what this periodical, which made its début in the theological world in April of 1944, has to say about both state and church (especially Roman Catholic Church) in Hungary seems to us to be very factual.

As to the background of the conflict between church and state *Theology Today* draws this picture: "It must also be remembered that Hungary never went through a political and economic revolution. Much of its life is still feudalistic. This cannot be blamed upon the Hungarians, since the old Hapsburg dynasty ruled the people with an iron hand. It was anything but a people's government. The terrific red revolution after the first World War was an abortive attempt to bring about radical reforms. It failed, and was overcome by a reactionary Horthy regime, in which the feudal interests of both Catholic and Protestant Churches were guaranteed. Further, education was largely in the control of the Churches. Perhaps fifty per cent of the elementary and sixty per cent of the secondary schools were owned and controlled by the Churches. We cannot vouch for the quality of this Church education, which the present Hungarian regime criticizes as unsocial and ecclesiastical. How much of a truly *people's* education was carried on in these Church schools it is difficult to say. The Churches owned great landed estates. Further, the Churches were deeply entrenched in the Horthy regime, and in many instances sanctioned that regime in its antagonism to reform forces."

The analysis made on this background of the present Hungarian government is as follows: "We cannot condone many of the actions of the present Hungarian government. It is a dynamic action-government, ruling by directives, and it is based upon a minority support of the Hungarian people. Many of the Communists in power are militantly godless. . . . The present Hungarian government is out to break every power within

the state which in any way would threaten or weaken its desire to bring all things under a common ideology and direction. . . . The Hungarian government today is bent upon radical land reforms, upon a common educational system for all Hungarian children and youth, and upon the creation of a state in which there are no classes. It will not rest until it has achieved these ends. Its point of view is exclusive, and it will not yield or compromise. It has offered to enter into a concordat with the Churches to guarantee them religious liberty within limits, to grant them state subsidies on a diminishing scale, to offer the Churches a number of schools in which to train their leaders, and to grant them the right to teach their faiths in the public schools. (In spite of these concessions, however, it is questioned whether the state will keep its promise once it has become dominant. Further, all sorts of intimidating methods are used to bring about Communistic objectives, especially in the teaching of history and ideological subjects in the schools.)”

The analysis made of the Roman Catholic Church and the Mindszenty case is the following: “It is well known that Mindszenty fought the land reform issue in 1945. (Hungary has over three million farmers who are part of the soil.) He opposed the nationalizing of the schools; he ordered Catholic schools closed, and forbade Catholic teachers to work in public schools. The Cardinal adamantly refused to negotiate with the state on the school issue. At last, the Pope’s message to Hungarian Catholics, with Mindszenty’s approval, practically asked them to disobey the state. We leave it to our readers to determine whether the Cardinal is guilty. The issue between the Cardinal and the state, after all, is primarily political and not religious. . . . The fact of the matter is that Cardinal Mindszenty is not convicted because of the issue of religious liberty. (The Reformed Church has been granted its liberty in Hungary through a concordat.) The issue between Mindszenty and the Hungarian government state has little to do with the proceedings of the trial, bad as they may have been, but with the clash of that state with the Roman Catholic conception of the Church and its place in the state. Granted there are other crucial issues involved, they are not central in the present case. . . .

“In the light of these facts in the Hungarian situation, it is highly important that we make our judgments regarding the Mindszenty case honestly. We can surely sympathize with the Cardinal; we can accept much of what Cardinal Spellman has to say about injustice in the Hungarian or any other state; we can think and pray earnestly about the Churches in Hungary as they move into a new order of society which is depriving them of schools and properties. But we cannot agree with Cardinal Spellman, or with those who would whip us into a crusading frenzy so as to become blind to the faults of a Roman Catholic conception of the Church which, if it obtained, would lead us into another kind of totalitarianism such as we have in Spain. . . . We are not convinced that the battle between the Roman Church and the Hungarian state is purely

a struggle between the force of Christ and anti-Christ (*sic!*). We believe that the issue is between the Roman Catholic Church and the Hungarian state.”

P. PETERS.

The United Lutheran Church of Germany and the Lutheran Confession. — In an article of the March 30 issue of *The Christian Century* on “German Churches Fail Youth,” the author, Iain Wilson, has something to say on “the pressure exerted on German church leaders by churches outside Germany,” especially by Lutheran churches of America. We quote:

“The Lutheran churches of America in particular have been deeply interested in the creation of the new United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Germany, whose formation under the leadership of Bishop Meiser they hail as a notable victory for what they profoundly believe to be constructive confessionalism. It is interesting, however, to note that many European Lutherans are not entirely happy about the type of moral pressure mentioned. Symptomatic of this is the fact that some German Lutheran provincial churches, including that of Oldenburg, thus far refuse to associate themselves with the new national church.

“The interconfessional ‘Confessional Church,’ which fought the nazis and which many hoped would be the forerunner of united Evangelical Christianity in Germany, has lost the initiative which it had in 1945. More than three years of intensive debate, often accompanied by sharp personal tensions, and of no real interest to the laymen of the churches, have produced a loose over-all federation of Evangelical churches within which is a compact Lutheran Church. The main future objectives of this United Lutheran Church, as described by Bishop Meiser in a recent interview, will be to strengthen Lutheran confessionalism, to build cooperation among the Lutheran churches, to unify liturgical practice and to produce a unified hymnbook.”

We are quoting these two paragraphs from the above mentioned article, not because we agree with everything that the author says, but because of some of its very enlightening statements regarding the “creation of the new United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Germany.” The first statement which, in our opinion, deserves special notice is the one to the effect that the Lutheran churches of America are hailing the formation of the United Lutheran Church “as a notable victory for what they profoundly believe to be constructive confessionalism.” The other statement is the one made by Bishop Meiser in a recent interview that “the main future objectives of this United Lutheran Church . . . will be to strengthen Lutheran confessionalism,” *i. e.*, within “a loose over-all federation of Evangelical churches,” as the author characterizes the EKD. In both statements “confessionalism” is being hailed; in the first statement as some-

thing that has been attained, in the second statement as something that is to be attained. We must confess that we cannot share these beliefs and hopes. From articles on the United Lutheran Church of Germany, written by Lutheran theologians of Germany and published in the previous numbers of our quarterly, we know that the *Reformed* churches of Germany and their leaders have every reason to hail the strengthening of *Reformed* confessionalism, while the Lutheran churches within the EKD have failed to safeguard the Lutheran Confession. Should there still be any doubt as to this in the minds of some of our readers, we can only suggest a careful perusal of Dr. Sasse's letter dealing with Lutheran confessionalism in Germany and America, which is appearing in this issue of the *Quartalschrift*.

But what about the "compact Lutheran Church" as such? Will it further and strengthen confessionalism in Germany or does it also, like the interconfessional Confessional Church harbor those who no longer profess the essential truths of the Scriptures and of the Lutheran Confessions? Let us hear what one of our German informants, who knows the Lutheran Church of Germany, writes us: "This VELKD encompasses all those in Hamburg, Leipzig, and Nürnberg who deny the divinity of Christ. She grants every pastor protection and toleration, who refuses to accept the basic truths of the Apostolic Creed. Only those who are professors of the Formula of Concord must hold their tongue. This is the church which at one time was abandoned by the fathers of the Prussian and Saxon Free Churches, even the fathers of Missouri itself. What has been said in the last number of the *Quartalschrift* (October, 1948) in regard to the theological discussions which Walther carried on with the German theologians of his time clearly characterizes the changed situation."

To be able to evaluate confessionalism in present-day Germany, we must not overlook the form which German Liberalism is taking on. As to this Liberalism our informant also writes us: "The great illusion of our day is the claim that Liberalism has been overcome. This is not true. As Harnack in his *Dogmengeschichte* differentiates between the acute (Gnosticism) and the chronic Hellenization, you must distinguish the acute Liberalism in the liberal and historical school of religion from the chronic in neo-orthodoxy. Hardly anyone of the church-leaders, apart from a few exceptional cases, are party to the old Liberalism. The chronic Liberalism, however, is the most dangerous. You only have to read the new dogmatics by Althaus (*Die christliche Wahrheit*), in which all the dogmas of the Apostolic Creed with the exception of the resurrection of the Lord are being denied. Nobody here believes in the Virgin Birth. Luther's doctrine concerning the total corruption of man is rejected. Our university students learn that Isaiah 53 does not have anything to do with Jesus and His suffering and death. Fun is made of inspiration. He who teaches it is not qualified for a professorship. No man, no bishop calls these theologians to order. Bultmann, a recognized leader

of the Confessional Church, teaches that Jesus neither was nor thought of Himself as the Messiah. You can read that in his *New Testament Theology*, which has just been published. No leaders of the Confessional Church are stirred up about it." Let us not be deceived. A revival of confessionalism in Germany is not yet a revival of Lutheran orthodoxy based on the Scriptures as on the infallible Word of God and on the Lutheran Confessions.

P. PETERS.

The Preamble of the Barmen Declaration. — In the two foregoing numbers of the *Quartalschrift* we published in translation *The Barmen Declaration* and a critical review of this Declaration by Oberkirchenrat Stoll of Munich. In the meantime we were requested by one of our readers to publish the *Preamble of the Declaration* also. Had this Preamble been at our disposal at the time when we set out to translate this document, we would, without fail, have begun with the work of translating the Preamble. Since that was not possible at the time, our readers will pardon us for publishing the Preamble as an appendage. We owe it to Dr. Sasse, who at our request made a copy of the major portion of the Preamble for us, that we can now add this important part to our translation of the Barmen Declaration. It reads in translation as follows:

"According to the introductory words of its constitution dated July 11, 1933, the German Evangelical Church is a confederation of confessional churches which have grown out of the Reformation with equal rights and on an equal footing. The theological premise for the union of these churches is to be found in Article I and Article II, 1 of the Constitution of the German Evangelical Church, which has been acknowledged by the government of the Reich on July 15, 1933.

"Article I: The inviolable basis of the German Evangelical Church is the Gospel of Jesus Christ testified to in the Holy Scriptures and set forth anew in the Confessions of the Reformation. Hereby the full powers which the Church needs for her mission are defined and limited."

Article II, 1 points out that the German Evangelical Church is made up of Land churches and then continues:

"We, the representatives of the Lutheran, Reformed, and United Churches, Synods, Conferences, and Dioceses, declare as a confessional synod of the German Evangelical Church that we are united on the common grounds of the DEK as a confederation of German confessional churches. As such we are united by the confession to the one Lord of the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. We declare publicly in the presence of all the Evangelical Churches of Germany that this common confession and consequently also the unity of the DEK has been most seriously jeopardized. (There follows a complaint of the destruction wrought by the "German Christians.")"

"United we as members of the Lutheran, Reformed, and United Churches needs must speak in this matter. Just because we want to be and want to remain true to our respective confessions, we dare not remain silent. We believe that in a time of common need and trial we have been called upon to speak a joint word. We commend it to God, whatever effect this may have on the relationship of the confessional churches toward one another.

"In view of the errors of the German Christians and of the present church government of the Reich we confess the following truths."

There follow the six Barmen theses with which our readers have already become acquainted. Dr. Sasse adds the following in his letter of February 4:

"It is clear that, first of all, this Preamble recognizes the DEK as a united church (Einigkeitskirche) organized as a confederacy in which the Lutheran, the Reformed, and the United Confessions have equal rights. Secondly, this Preamble grants members of the Lutheran, Reformed, and United Churches the authority to say jointly what is to be judged as pure and false doctrine in the Evangelical Church. This has been the one aim of Karl Barth and his followers. In other words: The Union Church was already recognized as such in the Preamble and the differences of doctrine were levelled off to the level of differences of the theological school within the one Evangelical Church, to which members of the Lutheran, Reformed, and United Churches belong."

Dr. Sasse, who at the Barmen Conference asked for but five minutes in which to offer reasons for protesting against the Barmen Declaration, was not permitted to speak, although he was a member of the Synod of Barmen. In recalling this incident he quotes the old Reformed dogmatician, Moses Amyraut: *In synodis non quaerunt potestatem, sed victoriam.*

As our readers were informed in the January issue of our quarterly, Dr. Sasse was the first theologian to separate himself for conscience sake from the EKD and to become a member of a Lutheran Free Church. His series of letters, the first of which appears in this issue, sets forth in detail the import of present-day developments in the Evangelical Church of Germany and for that matter in the Evangelical Lutheran Churches of the world.

P. PETERS.

How Far? In a recent article on liturgical matters (*Quartalschrift*, July, 1948, p. 178) we expressed our misgivings about the current tendency to seek one's liturgical ideals in the traditions of Rome. Some of our readers may have felt that we were needlessly concerned and that our judgments were unnecessarily severe. Evidence of this trend, however, continues to accumulate.

The "Holy Name" issue of *Una Sancta* (January, 1949) recently came to our desk. This periodical is published in the interest of the liturgical

movement by a group of editors hailing from many different sections of the Lutheran Church. In an article on the observance of the Christian year we find a liturgical program for Lent which among other things includes "the Office of the Blessing of Ashes" ("... send Thy Holy Angel from heaven to bless † and sanctify † these ashes...") and for Palm Sunday a similar service for "the Blessing of the Palms." On another page, explaining the cover design, the editor discusses "the Christian Feast of the Circumcision and the Name of Jesus." There we find the following statement: "Here Mary offers her Child for the first time as the eternal sacrifice, for 'without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins'."

Taking this last item first, we want to make due allowance for the fact that the writer was not undertaking a formal discussion of the soteriological significance of the Circumcision of Jesus. His words are more in the nature of a passing remark. Yet we must ask: Where is the Scriptural warrant for this view? Where does the Bible speak of circumcision as a sacrifice? How does Mary become the person who "offers" the eternal sacrifice? We would read this without surprise if it had appeared in a Catholic magazine. But how do Lutheran editors come to such views?

In the matter of the Ashes and the Palms it will probably be argued that there is nothing essentially wrong in using these material objects in the worship of the Church, that on the contrary they carry a symbolical value which we would do well not to ignore. But has History no lesson to teach? The early Church had its symbols, many of them. The medieval Church went to fantastic lengths in this respect. But where these practices did not lead to outright superstition they served to externalize the worship of the believers, focusing their attention on the niceties of outward form and ceremonial, and diverting them from the saving Word.

Lutheranism has, generally speaking, left these things behind. But how far along are our liturgical enthusiasts in their misguided retracing of the paths of history?

E. REIM.

The Midrash on Habakkuk. Among the scrolls of parchment which were found in a cave near the north shore of the Dead Sea, the Habakkuk scroll deserves special mention. Next to the Isaiah scroll it is of the greatest importance to the Old Testament scholar. It represents a midrash or commentary written on the Book of the prophet Habakkuk in the second century B. C. This commentary has now been translated by Professor W. H. Brownlee in the December, 1948, issue of the *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*. The scroll consists of 13 columns written from right to left. We already had been informed by the September, 1948, *Bulletin* that "the characters are written in a clear hand with black ink, remarkably well preserved," but that "several lines are missing at the bottom of all the thirteen columns of the scroll." Since the text

of Habakkuk is also quoted by the commentator, the find only grows in value for the Old Testament student.

Not only Isaiah but also Habakkuk had been dated by modern commentators as early as the Hellenistic age. Professor H. L. Ginsberg in the same issue of the *Bulletin* recalls "that Duhm, Proksch, Torrey, Nowack, and at one time Sellin held that the book of Habakkuk was a product of the time of Alexander." They had argued that *hakkas'dim* in Habakkuk 1, 6, rendered correctly by our King James Version with Chaldeans, was a corruption of *hakkittim*, Chittim, descendants of Javan (Gen. 10, 4), who inhabited Cyprus and the coasts of the Mediterranean. This conjecture has now been proved by means of our Midrash to have been a very arbitrary one, since our commentary also has the reading of *hakkas'dim*, although our commentator interprets them as *Chittim*, undoubtedly making them refer to the Ptolemies and Seleucids of his own time. Dr. Ginsberg is right in stating that our commentator "was just as mistaken as the aforementioned modern pundits" and in adding: "Investigators who feel tempted to date some verse or passage in the Prophets in the Hellenistic age can also learn a useful lesson from the Isaiah scroll of the second century B. C., which lacks none of the latest passages in the canonical Isaiah" (p. 21).

Our readers will, of course, want to know something of the manner in which our commentator wrote his midrash. First of all he quotes one or more verses of the text and follows this up by saying: "Its meaning concerns" . . . or "the meaning of the passage is" . . . or "it means thus" . . . He then offers a brief interpretation of the verses quoted, consisting of from one to two to five and more lines. For instance the beginning of column 5, which is to be found in chapter 1, verses 12b and 13a of our King James Version, where the prophet speaks of God ordaining His people for judgment, the commentator writes as follows: "The meaning of the passage is that God will not destroy His people by the hand of the nations; but by the hand of His elect, God will give the judgment of all the nations; and in their chastisement shall suffer all the wicked from among His people who keep His commandments in the time of their distress; for he of whom it speaks is 'too pure of eyes to look upon evil.' The meaning of this is that they do not lust after their eyes to the doom of wickedness."

The commentary suddenly ends, "apparently intentionally," with the last verse of chapter two: "Let all the earth keep silence before him." Our commentator has this to say on this verse: "Its meaning concerns all the nations who worship 'stone' and 'wood.' For on the day of judgment, God will destroy in the sea all the worshipers of 'wood'; and from off the earth, the wicked."

A commentary on the third chapter of the prophet, Habakkuk's prayer, does not follow.

P. PETERS.

NEWS WITHOUT COMMENT

From Religious News Service and Other Sources

Pakistan with its separation from the Dominion of India and independence from British rule, Pakistan has become the most populous Mohammedan country in the world. . . . Pakistan was formed so that Indian Moslems might not have to be a minority group ruled by a predominantly Hindu government in India. But there is no indication that they are ready to extend to other minorities under their control that same freedom from oppressive rule which they sought for themselves. The American ideal of full religious liberty within the pattern of an orderly society seems incomprehensible to the Moslem. Not long ago the minister of education in West Pakistan made the following statements:

1. "I should make it clear that an institution cannot be allowed to preach in the name of education a particular religion to students who do not profess that religion."
2. "My ministry has decided that religious instruction should be made compulsory for the Muslim students in all educational institutions either managed by the state or receiving grants-in-aid from the state, and that similar facilities would be provided for the non-Muslims should they so desire."

These statements seem very reasonable to the Moslem. His attitude is similar to that of the Roman Catholic, who says, "Error has no right to propagate itself." But if such a policy is approved in the constitution now being drawn up, it will be disastrous to mission schools. Even should they desire to dispense with the grants-in-aid they would be forbidden to teach the Bible to any who are not professed Christians, nor is there any guarantee that they might not still be obliged to hire at their own expense Moslem teachers of the Koran for any Moslem students who might enroll.
— *Moody Monthly*.

Romanian Uniate or Greek Catholics have severed their ties with Rome and joined the Romanian Orthodox Church, it was announced in Bucharest by Patriarch Justinian, supreme leader of the Orthodox body, to which most Romanians belong. The patriarch's announcement said that thirty-six priests and two archpriests of the Byzantine Church, representing 423 priests of their rite, had met at Cluj on October 1 and voted unanimously to submit a petition for reunion with the Orthodox Church. Simultaneously, the conference issued an appeal to Uniate believers to accept their decision. Subsequently, Patriarch Justinian disclosed, a Greek Catholic delegation was sent to Bucharest to submit the conference's decision to the Orthodox patriarchate. The delegates were received at a

solemn session of the Orthodox Synod and later participated at a special celebration of the Orthodox Liturgy, which was broadcast throughout the nation. Ranking next to the Ruthenian Rite Catholics as the second-largest body of Eastern Rite Catholics, the Romanian Byzantines, numbering about 1,250,000, were united with Rome in 1697 when an Act of Unity was signed at Blaj, Transylvania. Large numbers emigrated to the United States and smaller groups to Canada. The Byzantine Church is said to have 1,725 churches and more than 700 priests, headed by a metropolitan and four bishops. Their greatest stronghold is at Cluj, where many Greek Catholics are said to be opposed to the reunion with Orthodoxy despite threats that refusal to join the Orthodox Church may be viewed as unfriendliness toward the Romanian Popular government. Consequently the Romanian Reunion Movement is only backed by a minority of Romania's Greek Catholic parishes who have so far responded to an appeal by Patriarch Justinian, head of the Romanian Orthodox Church, to renounce their ties with the Vatican and return to Orthodoxy. The pro-government newspaper, *Universal*, published here, has printed the names of 430 Greek Catholic priests who accepted the Orthodox patriarch's invitation, but more than thousand priests have so far given no indication of their attitude. . . . According to *Civiltà Cattolica*, Jesuit review, about 90 per cent of the married clergy who had previously held out against "reunion," yielded under pressure from their wives, whose oft-repeated complaint was: "What about me and the children if you have to go to prison?" "Among the people generally," *Civiltà* said, "many gave in out of that traditional Romanian submissiveness which comes from feeling that opposition is fruitless." *Civiltà*, which is considered one of the best-informed church publications in Rome, said it based its information on reports from Romanian Catholics who had fled to Rome. The journal said that the "persecution" of Eastern Rite Catholics in Romania was only a curtain-raiser, and that even harsher treatment is in store for Catholics of the Latin Rite. Many Eastern Rite priests "in spite of maltreatment" had resisted "forced conversion" to the Romanian Orthodox Church, *Civiltà* declared.

Behind the "Bamboo Curtain" of Communist China it is extremely difficult at this stage to get a clear picture of what is likely to happen to Christian education as a whole. Scattered reports from Communist territory beyond the Yangtze River indicate that while Communist officials may be meditating a complete ideological "crackdown" on Christian schools, they have not yet adopted definite, uniform policies. Mission authorities in Yenching have stated that "religious and academic freedom here is unimpaired." Equally encouraging reports have come from Tsinan, capital of the Shantung Province, where Protestant church workers remained on the job after the Communists swept in. Communist restrictions on church schools appear so far to have been confined to ordering them to drop civics courses teaching Nationalist principles and to substitute courses

based on Communist tenets. However, in many cases, the lack of textbooks and of teachers has made this an empty gesture — for the present at least. The Communists are also reportedly requiring Christian teachers to attend one-month indoctrination courses at Communist training schools. The present situation appears to parallel that which prevailed when the Nationalists came into power and ordered all mission schools to register with the government and accept a standard curriculum. Another decree banned religious teachings in elementary and junior middle schools, but this ruling soon ceased to be enforced.

The Evangelical Church in Germany (EKID) embraces 27 affiliated churches, with a total membership of 39,833,434, according to statistics released by Church authorities here. A breakdown of EKID's constituency shows 13 Lutheran "Land," or provincial Churches, with 20,304,111 members; 12 "United" Churches, with 19,113,049 members; and two "Reformed" Churches, with 416,274 adherents. The Soviet occupation zone has three Lutheran and five United Churches, with a total of 17,408,932 members, equal to 43.7 per cent of EKID's strength. In the three western zones, there are 10 Lutheran Churches, seven United and two Reformed, with 22,424,502 members, equal to 56.3 per cent of the total EKID membership.

Publication of the Yearbook of the Evangelical Church in Germany is under way for the first time since 1933, it was announced in Berlin. The church annual is being produced by the Bertelsmann publishing house at Guetersloh in the British zone.

A Joint Theological Seminary for Romania's three historic Protestant Churches — the Reformed, Lutheran, and Unitarian — was formally opened in Cluj, capital of Transylvania, former Hungarian province which is now Romanian. The ceremonies were presided over by the Rev. Albert Maksay, rector of the faculty. He introduced Dr. Petre Manu, Under Secretary of the Cults Ministry, who attended as official representative of the Romanian government. Others present were Reformed Bishop John Vasarhelyi, Unitarian Bishop Alexis Kiss, Bishop Frederic Muller of the Saxonian Lutheran Church and the Greek Orthodox Bishop of Cluj. Establishment of a joint seminary was made compulsory by the Romanian government. The seminary will give women equal rights with men in regard to receiving ministerial diplomas. In addition to the rector, the seminary staff includes eleven professors, equitably distributed among the three sponsoring Churches.

143 Roman Catholic Teachers were barred by District Judge E. T. Hensley from public school teaching posts in New Mexico. Judge Hensley's ruling also prohibited the holding of tax-supported school classes in

buildings owned by the Roman Catholic Church. The written judgment supplemented an oral decision from the bench on October 7 in which Judge Hensley ruled that "there is no separation of Church and State" in some New Mexico public schools, thus violating the state and national constitutions. Other declaratory judgments in the ruling specifically prohibited the following:

- Free state bus transportation for students in parochial schools;
- Purchase from public funds of textbooks for parochial schools and purchase of books especially for Catholic schools;
- Teaching of sectarian doctrine in any tax-supported school;
- Holding of public school classes in rooms where religious or sectarian symbols are displayed;
- Payment by the state of persons teaching sectarian doctrines.

The ruling also stated that the 143 garbed Catholic teachers who taught in the twenty-eight schools "be forever barred from receiving any school monies and employment in the public schools of this state." The ruling was on specific issues only. It did not state that nuns as such could not teach or that the garb of teachers is a religious influence.

America's Parochial Schools "are legitimate claimants for federal aid," the Rt. Rev. Msgr. David C. Gildea, told an audience of Catholic laymen here. Consignor Gildea, superintendent of parochial schools in the Syracuse diocese, said "parochial schools perform a public service," in that "any school to which parents may send their children to fulfill the compulsory education law, does serve the public." He estimated the cost to the federal government if it was to replace the nation's parochial schools at "more than a billion dollars." He said "the experience educators gained through the federal lunch program and the GI Bill of Rights have led them away from suspicion of the federal control factor in a governmental aid program to education." Federal legislation that fails to take action in favor of children in non-public schools is "unjustly discriminatory," Msgr. Gildea added. "Every child in a parochial school is an American citizen," he said, "and entitled to justice, fair play, equity and full democratic rights." Monsignor Gildea pointed out that federal aid to education has been a subject before Congress for more than three-quarters of a century, and "it does seem a satisfactory bill will be passed during the current session."

Support of Church Schools. — Use of public funds for the "direct or indirect" support of church schools was opposed by the 74th annual conference of the American Association of School Administrators. The resolution, one of the 22 introduced by a committee, declared: "We believe the American tradition of separation of Church and State should be vigorously and seriously safeguarded. We reassert the right of special interest groups, including religious denominations, to maintain their own schools as long as such schools meet the standards defined by the state in

which they are located. We believe that these separate schools should be financed entirely by their own supporters. We therefore oppose all efforts to devote public funds either to the direct or indirect support of such schools."

"Are Protestant Parochial Schools a Threat to Public Education and Democracy?" — As long as Protestant parochial schools receive no federal aid, they do not constitute a threat to public education or democracy, it was asserted in a statement released by the Board of Parish Education of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. It took issue with the International Council of Religious Education which, at its recent meeting in Columbus, Ohio, registered sharp opposition to Protestant parochial schools and condemned any further development of Protestant parochial education, particularly at the elementary and secondary levels. The statement pointed out that there are only 154,000 children enrolled in Protestant parochial schools as compared with 24,101,000 children in public schools and 2,519,000 attending Roman Catholic parochial schools. These figures, the statement said, make it "arrant nonsense to call such a development of the Protestant parochial schools a threat to public education."

The Walther League, youth organization of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, raised \$170,721 during its 1948 campaign to aid tubercular patients in the denomination's sanatorium at Wheat Ridge, Colorado, it was announced here by the American Lutheran Publicity Bureau. The campaign is conducted annually through the sale of Wheat Ridge Christmas seals. Topping the list of sales was the League's Northern Illinois District, with \$20,945. The Minnesota District sold \$20,341 worth of seals, and the South Wisconsin District had \$19,549 to its credit. It was announced here that the 1949 International Walther League convention will be held at Houston, Texas, July 10-14.

The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod will send its first American missionary of Japanese ancestry to Japan, it was announced here by Dr. Otto H. Schmidt, the denomination's executive secretary for foreign missions. The missionary, the Rev. George Tomoo Shibata, who prepared for service in the Orient at the University of California, Berkeley, will leave San Francisco on April 15. He will be stationed in Tokyo, where the Missouri Synod started a mission project in February. Dr. Schmidt said the Church will have eight missionaries working in Japan by the end of the summer.

A Sunday School by Mail Project — aimed at bringing the Christian message to children living in isolated sections of the United States and to those not attending regular Sunday schools — has been launched by the Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod. Ac-

ording to an announcement by Dr. J. W. Behnken, president of the Church, the program will be sponsored jointly by the denomination's board for missions in North and South America, the board for parish education, and the International Lutheran Hour, a radio program. Children will be enrolled in the Sunday school by mail project through locally-sponsored newspaper advertisements and spot announcements on radio stations. The program is said to represent the first major attempt by an American church body to bring a regular course of Bible-centered Christian study into the homes of unchurched people. If the program works on a national scale, plans call for extending it on a world-wide front in various languages.

A New Family Magazine, to be called *This Day*, will be launched in September by the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, it was announced here by the Rev. Henry Rische, who has been appointed editor of the publication. Purpose of the new periodical, Mr. Rische said, will be to encourage Christian home ideals. It will be patterned after the popular magazines but will stress high moral standards. "While it is church-sponsored and will be governed by Christian principles," Mr. Rische said, "our new magazine will not feature church organizational propaganda but will be gauged for general interest and will be designed to compare favorably with standard popular magazines. Our object is to entertain in a Christian way."

A New Hebrew-English Bible will be published shortly by the Jewish Publication Society of America, it was announced at the group's annual dinner in Philadelphia. In addition to the Bible, the Society plans to bring out a revised and expanded edition of Graetz's "History of the Jews." A \$250,000 fund-raising drive will be launched to finance these projects.

Okinawa has witnessed a 300 per cent increase in Christian conversions since the war. Before the war there were 18 congregations with 800 members on this Pacific island. Today there are 40 churches with 3,000 members, and at least 3,000 others attend services regularly. The increase is attributed by Yoshio Higa, head of the Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. youth departments on Okinawa, to the fact that the Japanese are no longer in Okinawa to repress Christianity, and to the fact that American soldiers gained reputations as "Good Samaritans" during hostilities there.

Bad Boll. — Dr. Bodensieck has been invited to take part in a meeting of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Germany, the Missouri Synod and the National Lutheran Council to be held next June at Bad Boll, Germany. In the event that Dr. Bodensieck accepts this invi-

tation, he will leave by air for Germany the latter part of May and return to Dubuque the first part of July. — *Wartburg Seminary Quarterly*.

"In Higher Education." — Including A. L. C. students at Saskatoon and Pacific Lutheran there are 2,459 students as compared with 2,324 last year in our colleges and seminaries dear to the heart of our American Lutheran Church. A grand total of 210 young men is in our seminaries as compared with 178 last year. A grand total of 723 students is preparing for full-time church work as compared with 642 last year. Of the 2,161 at our colleges 1,595 or 73.8 per cent are Lutheran. . . . There is increased cooperation in Lutheran higher education. The U. L. C. A., E. L. C., and Augustana Synod are cooperating with us in the operation of Texas Lutheran College. The U. L. C. A. has agreed to help support Luther College, Regina, beginning with next year. We continue in the support of Saskatoon Seminary. The W. M. F. has appropriated \$100,000 as an initial gift to the educational ingathering, scheduled for 1950. — *Lutheran Standard*.

REVIEWERS' DESK

A Handbook of Organizations. By Theodore Graebner. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri. 1948. Price: \$4.50.

This book, a volume of 363 pages preceded by two treatises concerning the lodge questions, is the successor of two smaller books by the same author, one published in 1925 and called *Winning the Lodge-man: A Handbook of Secret Societies*, the other in 1927 titled *The Secret Empire — A Handbook of Lodges*. They have been supplying valuable information not readily obtainable otherwise, and are found on the book shelves of many of our pastors. Since the present volume is considerably larger than the two books just mentioned and more exhaustive, there is little doubt but that it will be purchased by our pastors for their libraries as a standard reference work on lodges and other anti-Scriptural societies soliciting members in our congregations. The name of the author, a professor in Concordia Theological Seminary at St. Louis, Missouri, and an editor of the *Lutheran Witness*, has long stood in the eyes of Lutherans of the Synodical Conference and beyond its confines, and of men in other Protestant denominations, as a guarantee of the authenticity of its contents and the reliability of its judgments. Whether due to sluggishness of independent thinking or not, there is among the clergy a marked tendency, usually hidden under the cloak of modesty and respect for the teacher, to fall in line with the opinions and to abide by the decisions of the leaders of the Church — a tendency fraught with grave danger for sound Lutheranism and certainly contrary to the principle laid down in the Confessions of our Church that the Word of God alone, *sola scriptura*, is the norm of faith and life. The more reason, then, for the conscientious reader to keep

clear in his mind the difference between the objective factual information offered in the volume under discussion and the subjective opinion or judgment at which the author may arrive on the basis of the facts.

The "Handbook" is divided into two parts. The first treats of "Societies Organized on the Lodge System" on 286 pages; the second, comprising 74 pages, bears the caption "Various Organizations: Veterans, Businessmen, Young Men and Women, Junior."

Rarely does it happen that a confirmed lodge man, one thoroughly conversant with the religious concepts of his society, will apply for membership in our church. Ordinarily we are dealing with men who are either ignorant of the spiritual features of the lodge or of the meaning of Christianity, or of both. In any case it becomes our duty to demonstrate the incompatibility of the Christian religion with the tenets of the lodge. To do this successfully it is highly desirable for us to be able to furnish documentary proof for our assertions. A pastor may be challenged as to the accuracy of his data. Are they perhaps antiquated? Have recent changes in the constitution or regulations been made eliminating what formerly was objectionable? Here this "Handbook" is a real help. It furnishes a wealth of information on a large number of organizations, in some instances as recent as of the year 1948. A cursory glance at the table of contents or through the index is convincing proof of its usefulness. Copious quotations from rituals, constitutions, and other official lodge literature are providing incontrovertible testimony about the society under discussion to the lodge man applying for church membership or to the Christian about to join the lodge.

There are two matters on which we feel ourselves constrained to comment because here we are in disagreement with the author:

1) Pertaining to lodges which have let down the bars so far that one may make use of their insurance department without being required to become a member of the lodge. The "Ancient Order of United Workmen" and the "Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks" may serve as examples. With respect to the first we read the following statement in the "Handbook": "We see no reason for barring anyone from (church) membership for his purchasing insurance from this Order by simply signing the application blank" (p. 79). The A. O. U. W. of Minnesota "does not insist that members attend and participate" in the ritual. "Instead of saying that the A. O. U. W. has made the ritual optional and therefore is no longer a lodge, we should say that the A. O. U. W. is a lodge, which, however, maintains a special insurance department for those who do not wish to join in the lodge" (p. 80). This opinion is voiced on the strength of information obtained from headquarters in Minnesota, likewise in Kansas and North Dakota, while the home office of the order in Seattle, Washington, answered an inquiry thus: "The A. O. U. W. of Washington has not changed from the lodge system to the co-operative insurance

system" (p. 82). Regarding social membership in the Order of Elks we are told: "Where the local Elks lodge has the reputation of a respectable organization and not as elsewhere the reputation of hard drinkers, gluttons and men of immoral lives, such 'social membership' cannot be regarded as sinful in itself. There would be no obligation under a lodge ritual, and no conformity with the world in the Biblical sense. There would still be the question of offending the weak by giving the appearance at least of weakening in our stand regarding the lodge. The simplest solution, of course, is a negative one; but you cannot reach the conscience by simply saying No! Where our people are educated up to the true understanding of what is wrong about the lodge, they will also see the difference between lodge membership and some kind of business or social connection without initiation on an anti-Christian ritual or participating in deistic prayers, syncretistic ceremonials, burial services, etc." (pp. 97, 98).

To the opinions expressed by the author in the foregoing quotations we take exception for more than one reason. However for the sake of brevity we here confine ourselves to the question: Are we justified in assuming our people, or a majority of them, have a "true understanding of what is wrong about the lodge"? Or is it not the common experience of our pastors that many Christians in our congregations refrain from joining a lodge not from a deep conviction of its anti-Christian nature but rather "because our church is against it," or some such reason? But we do reject the implication that the church member associating himself to a lodge with an insurance policy or with purchasing social membership is strong in faith, while he must be considered a weak brother who for conscience sake not only for his own person refuses to enter into such relation with the lodge but is offended by his fellow-Christian who does. When a Lutheran of the Synodical Conference enters into an alliance of sorts with a lodge while he knows our stand in the lodge question and professedly agrees to it, we cannot help but look upon him as a weak brother. For he should realize that by such action he gives the almost unavoidable impression of an at least tolerant disposition toward the lodge, especially since there are any number of business organizations in the country for the express purpose of writing insurance, which are eager to serve him. Under these circumstances it is such a Christian's fault when the outsider comes to believe our Church is taking a more conciliatory attitude toward the lodge than formerly. Surely, here the warning of the apostle is applicable: "See then that ye walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise" (Eph. 5, 15).

2) The other matter in which we do not see eye to eye with the author pertains to "Various Organizations" mentioned in the last part of the "Handbook." It is obvious that a faithful Christian is confronted with dangers for his faith whenever he comes in contact with the unbelieving world. That is unavoidable, is as it should be, for he has the commission to bring the message of salvation to a sin-lost world. Jesus says

in his great intercessory prayer (John 17): "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world. . . . Neither pray I for them alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word" (vv. 18, 20). But to join special groups in this world and to take upon ourselves certain obligations through voluntary membership in them is no part of our God-given calling. It becomes in such cases a duty of brotherly love for the pastor or fellow-Christian to point out the danger inherent in membership in a secular society.

As a rule, no committee responsible for the management of a public get-together will forget to include in the program an invocation and benediction by a Catholic priest, a Protestant minister, or a Jewish rabbi, preferably by representatives of different churches at the same occasion. Our protests against this prevailing un-American "American" custom have, by and large, been unavailing. It seems almost impossible to dedicate a public building in state and nation, to hold commencement exercises of a public school without the functioning of some clergymen. This being so, it is only logical, and in no wise a sin against the Eighth Commandment, to assume that in the case of a permanent organization for civic, social, or benevolent purposes the "American" custom of making religious exercises a part of the program will be followed. Our Church with its testimony against unionism in joint prayer and worship has been made to feel the impact of unpopularity whenever through a specific case the general public was made aware of our stand.

After the First World War our Church received much adverse publicity because we spoke a word of warning to the veterans of our congregations when the "American Legion" solicited them for membership. With the return of the many veterans after the end of the last great war new veterans' organizations were springing up, which in turn acted as a stimulus to those already existing. The competitive spirit which arose between them gave impetus to determined drives for gaining new members from the ranks of the demobilized soldiers also in our congregations. We dare not stand idly by. To guard our young brethren against danger to their faith that frequently arises out of organizational affiliation with men of different creeds, where Protestants and Catholics, Jews and non-church men meet on an equal footing and with equal rights, is our sacred obligation. And in the light of past experience it is almost a foregone conclusion that through the injection of a religious element in their rituals, etc., our Lutheran veterans are exposed to the practice of unionism of the worst kind. They are tempted to idol worship, no mention being made in the religious exercises of our Savior Jesus Christ, who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life and without whom no one can come to the Father (John 14, 6). Idol worship because "all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. He that honoreth not the Son honoreth not the Father which hath sent him" (John 5, 23). Hence, as long as, *e. g.*, the "Veterans of

Foreign Wars" do not revoke their ritual, of which the "Handbook" says it "has a strong religious flavor. It contains prayers . . . In these prayers there is no reference to Jesus Christ" (p. 304), we must take issue with the opinion of the "Handbook": "It follows that membership in the VFW . . . does not conflict with the fellowship principles of the Lutheran Church," even though one may be absolved from obtaining membership by oral obligation in a meeting and from taking part in memorial services (p. 307).

Another group we must mention is "The Boy Scouts of America." We have been and still are in full agreement with the resolution of the Missouri Synod in the 1938 convention which speaks of the naturalistic and unionistic tendencies still prevalent in the Boy Scout movement. We deplore the change in our sister synod's position as indicated in a resolution of the 1944 convention. We quote from the memorial of May, 1947, addressed to the Missouri Synod by our Standing Committee on Church Union: "Since then, the number of troops in your Synod has multiplied rapidly, resulting in great difficulties, especially in such fields where our Synods are working side by side, and creating grave and dangerous strains" (Wis. Syn. Proceedings 1947, p. 105). The "Handbook" says of the Boy Scout program: "Its avowed purpose is . . . to offer the congregations its program for a wider application of the divine truths learned" in the church (p. 351). We maintain the Church cannot accept this offer, however well meant, without a denial of the truth of the Gospel. For further elucidation we refer the readers to the resolutions of our Joint Synod at its 1947 convention (Proceedings, pp 106-111).

M. LEHNINGER.

The Communion of Saints. *A Study of the Origin and Development of Luther's Doctrine of the Church.* By Herman A. Preus, M. Th., Ph. D., Professor at Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota. 12 plus 172 pages, 5½×8¼. Buckram. Title on front and backbone. Price, \$2.00. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis.

In this book the author traces, as the subtitle indicates, the origin and the development of Luther's doctrine of the Church. Since he thus limits the scope of his book, one must not look for a comprehensive treatment of the Scripture doctrine of the Church in its wide ramifications and manifold implications. The unity of the Church, the unfolding of a church body's banner in a clear-cut confession, and the like, are merely touched. The steps are traced by which Luther, entangled in Roman concepts, was led to realize the spiritual nature of the Church, and the comfort which her glory brought to his troubled heart.

The undersigned does not agree with the author when on p. 96 he says "that they (Word and Sacraments) are *of the essence* of the Church." — It is misleading when he stresses (p. 100) that "it is the *spoken Word*

which is the life-giving power of the Church." The quotation from Luther does not contain the stress on the oral form of the Word, but emphasizes the power of the Word as such. In connection with John 7, 38 (He that believeth on me . . . out of his belly shall flow rivers of living waters) Luther remarks: *Wenn Gottes Wort aus einem gläubigen Munde hergehet, so sind es lebendige Worte*, etc. Luther leads up to this statement with the remark: *Das Wort macht lebendig*; and in the next paragraph he makes the application: *Derhalben soll man das Wort Gottes in Ehren halten*. The author's mistake is in the translation of the apodosis, introduced by *so* (*SO sind es lebendige Worte*). He translates: "*then it is a living Word*," etc. The German *so* is not a temporal demonstrative, but merely marks the beginning of the apodosis. The Word of God, whether spoken or written, is a living, powerful thing.

Under the heading: IT IS GOD WHO BRINGS US INTO THE CHURCH THROUGH THE MEANS OF GRACE, we read the following: "To really break in and become one with the family of God is for the Christian to go to the Lord's Supper. There he really enters into the family of kindred spirits." It is certainly true that the Lord's Supper unites the Christians with Christ their Head and with one another as members. "For we being many are one bread and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread" (1 Cor. 10, 17). But in speaking about the unifying fruit of the Supper one must never fail to stress the answer of the Small Catechism to the question: "How can bodily eating and drinking do such great things?" Such great things as the blessings of the Sacrament enumerated in the previous question, namely among others also "life and salvation," rest on the forgiveness of sins which the Sacrament conveys, so also this blessing that it confirms our membership in the spiritual body of Christ. Through faith in the forgiveness are we united with Christ, and by the same faith also with our fellow believers. These fruits are not produced by the mere eating and drinking, but, as Luther points out, by the words of promise that are attached to the Sacrament. These truths are set forth beautifully by the author in other connections, but in view of some tendencies today it is doubly important that the forgiveness of sins be made the starting point in speaking about the unifying effects of the Supper. In Jesus' words the Supper serves the purpose of "remembrance." How can it serve that purpose if the blessings to be remembered are only indistinctly cognized in the first place? We add another warning. Above we referred to 1 Cor. 10, 17. Let us not forget 1 Cor. 12, 13: "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." When Paul, in Eph. 4, stresses the unity of the Church he refers to the common calling of all Christians, and to the "one Baptism," but does not even mention the Supper in this connection.

From the above mentioned exceptions which the undersigned takes to the presentation of the author let no one draw the conclusion that the book as such is inferior. It is my custom, when reading a book for

review, to put a *plus* and a *minus* sign on the flyleaf. Above I discussed the three points that I entered in the minus column. The plus column, containing references to important truths well stated, is at least five times as long, and then I stopped listing any more because a reviewer may not quote more than 500 words without special permission.

The author endeavors to make the Church, the spiritual body of Christ — faith in which we confess in the Third Article, but the glory of which has in modern times faded out of our consciousness to an alarming extent — again a living reality to us. He complains that “the idea of the Church has become to us a lifeless theory for theologians to debate” (p. 5); that “she seems to be losing her identity . . . she has become all too much a part of the world” (p. 8). Basis for the struggle to revitalize our faith in the Church must be the “doctrine of justification by faith. . . . For the Church is the fellowship of all believers, the communion of all those who have been justified by grace through faith in Jesus Christ” (p. 28). To this must be added the other truth that the “Church is a spiritual communion of believers, where Christ rules by His blessed Gospel” (p. 60). “The only thing that has ever been able to stop the Roman Church, reform it or cleanse it, has been the preaching and the free dissemination of the Word of God” (p. 105), meaning the Gospel of justification.

From the table of contents one can hardly get a fair idea of the rich treasure store presented on comparatively few pages; yet we briefly list it. The book is divided into three parts, the first treating of “Luther and the doctrine of the Church in history” in two chapters: “Luther and the problem of the Church” and: “Luther and the ancient tradition.” Part two treats of “Luther the Roman Catholic” in three chapters: “The obedient son” — “The Catholic critic” — “Luther the rebel.” Part three presents “Luther the reformer” in five chapters: “The communion of saints” — “The object of our faith” — “The perennial reformation” — “The experience of holy communion” — “The keys of the kingdom.”

Instructive, stimulating, refreshing reading.

M.

A Re-Orientation. Atonement and Forgiveness. By Jacob Tanner.

XI plus 114 pages, 5½×8½. Blue cloth, with gold title on front and backbone. Price \$1.75. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis.

We heartily agree with the author when he places the forgiveness of sins into the center of theology, and treats it as a “revolutionary force” through which the “Holy Spirit changes both direction and motive” (p. 81) of a man’s life.

Faith is defined in this way that through the message of reconciliation by the Holy Spirit “the soul is persuaded to yield itself to Christ and accept Him and His free gift of forgiveness” (p. 88). Faith saves, not because it were “a necessary contribution” in addition to Christ’s work,

nor because by it "we prove ourselves worthy" (p. 86). It is not of our own making, and our assurance of salvation does not rest on our faith; it all rests on "Him who provided an over-abundance of forgiveness for the abundance of my sins" (p. 92).

It is commendable that the author thus calls attention not only to the central position of the forgiveness of sins but to its life-giving power as proclaimed in the Word. The forensic, declaratory nature of justification is thus elevated from the level of a mere paper transaction. It is a "definite historic process" in which "vital forces are in action" (p. X), which the "streamlining" efforts of "philosophers and systematizers" would reduce to a "skeleton without flesh and blood and without a living soul" (p. X).

Yet the book must be read with caution. There are some flaws, of which we mention a few. The fact that in Old Testament times "only a remnant belonged to God" is accounted for in this way: "The Kingdom of Heaven lacked adequate means for a victorious fight against Satan." Its means were "sufficient to produce victories in individual cases" only (p. 18). Speaking of the "piecemeal character" of Old Testament sacrifices creates the impression that "the sacrifice of an animal could make up for it" (i. e. sin) actually (p. 35). Again we meet with the phrase: "the limitation of the power of God's saving grace in the Old Testament" (p. 48). — The meaning of "reconciliation" (2 Cor. 5) is misunderstood when defined as "to change a person's feelings and attitude" — "the flesh is enmity towards God" — but then God's love is presented to us "in order to change our hostile attitude" and "become reconciled to Him" (p. 60-62). That is conversion, not reconciliation. Paul himself explains reconciliation as "not imputing men's trespasses unto them" but, instead, making "him to be sin for us who knew no sin" — thus changing the social status of the world before Him. — While the author is speaking of Adam before the fall (p. 8), yet the expression "moral beings with freedom of decision and choice" might seem to refer to man in general, also after the fall. Compare also the statement that the forgiveness of sins "releases power to overcome man's . . . enemies" (p. 81). The remark in the next sentence that "God's power is at work in man" does not quite clarify the situation, because, as p. 78 informs us, man "is *enabled* to walk after the Spirit, to be led by the Spirit, to possess the Spirit of adoption," etc. In agreement with this, repentance is treated as a condition of salvation. Peter preached that the people "*must* repent of their hatred against Jesus Christ . . . they *must* realize that He is the Son of God, and therefore *must* confess their sin and turn to Him"; and that "*if* they would repent, i. e., turn from their sins to Him, He would forgive their sins and thus enable them to begin a new life" (p. 39. 40).

All of these expressions are liable to misunderstanding; they somewhat mar a person's joy in reading a stimulating and instructive book.

M.

The Organization of the Missouri Synod. A Paper read at the *Centennial Convention* at the Palmer House, Chicago, July 22 and 23, 1947. By William Dallmann, D.D. Published by request. Pamphlet of 32 pages. Price, 15 cents. Northwestern Publishing House.

The essay of Dr. Dallmann is prefaced by a Foreword of President J. W. Behnken. In the body of the essay the author briefly summarizes the three books of Dr. Walther: "Church and Ministry, The Proper Form of a Free Church, and The Evangelical Lutheran Church, the True Visible Church" as being "first principles" by means of which "the whole of the subsequent movement of Missouri was worked out" (p. 8).

To the undersigned a remark on p. 15 seems an unfortunate oversimplification: "There are whispers of bureaucracy. What an absurdity! How can there be bureaucracy when every three short years you can turn the rascals out?" — This overlooks the fact that once the powers of darkness have gained a foothold it is not so easy to get rid of them again. A little heaven leaveneth the whole lump.

On page 27 the author vows: "In the State we have had the disastrous *Missouri Compromise*; in the Church we will have no *Missouri Compromise*." We hope and pray that, numerous alarming incidents to the contrary notwithstanding, God may graciously preserve our sister synod from compromising the truth. Karl Barth is right: "If all churches are completely obedient to Christ, all differences will be solved" (quoted on p. 26). — "We pray for grace to obey His Word. *Stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way; and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls*" (p. 32). M.

Les Premiers Confessions de foi Chretiennes par Oscar Cullmann. Paris, Presses Universitaires De France, 1948. 2e édit. Prix: 100 fr.

Our author, professor at the University of Strassburg and of Basle, has written a number of treatises on the ancient Church and on primitive Christianity, some in German, others in French. *Weihnachten in der Alten Kirche* was reviewed in the July, 1948, number of the *Quartalschrift*. The title of another writing in German reads: *Urchristentum und Gottesdienst*. Professor Cullmann's present work deals with the "first confessions" of the Christian faith. Our author wants to show the structure and essence that these first confessions took on. In other words, he wants to take us back to the time prior to the Apostolic Creed, prior even to the New Testament Canon into the middle of the first century. There he wants to discover symbols which present themselves to our view not necessarily as confessions penned by the Apostles, but rather as spontaneous creations of the primitive Church. Such confessions are for instance: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God" spoken by the eunuch before his baptism (Acts 8, 37), or "Christ is Lord" (Phil. 2, 11). These confessions have, according to the author, a *place dans la vie*, a *Sitz im Leben*, or as we

may add, "a first home," where they were forged and formed, such places and circumstances being baptism, persecutions, exorcism, and polemical writings against the heretics. For example, "Jesus Christ our Lord" was used, according to our author, in the hour of martyrdom in contrast to *Kyrios Kaisar*. The final point that Professor Cullmann wants to make is that the very essence of these confessions is limited to expressions of faith in Christ and that the symbolical expressions referring to God the Father and the Holy Spirit were added and are to be understood in the light of the former. To quote: *le point de départ et le centre de la foi chrétienne, c'est la foi en Christ* (p. 40).

Professor Cullmann in this treatise is proceeding from the premise that between the years 50 and 150 A. D. the first Christian writings appeared in large numbers and that from among these many writings 27 were officially canonized in the middle of the 2nd century. According to this premise the New Testament writings can only be but a depository of the first confessions of primitive Christianity, the product of a *Gemeinde-theologie*. Consequently the primitive confessions must first be gleaned from these writings, if we want to see them in their original form. While we do not question the conclusion at which the author arrives that "the point of departure and the center of the Christian faith is the faith in Christ," we nevertheless ask whether the confessions of Jesus' disciples, spoken in the very presence of their Lord (Mt. 16, 16; Jn. 20, 28), were not the first confessions of primitive Christianity? And was not the presence of the Lord, prior to His resurrection and immediately after, the *place dans la vie*, and the confessions laid down by his followers as eye and ear witnesses the oldest both as to form and content? We ask these questions because Professor Cullmann tells us that we are to occupy ourselves with the whole prehistory of the later confessions, which certainly also includes that of Christ's sojourn here on earth with His disciples.

To those of our readers who desire to acquaint themselves more fully with this study of the New Testament writings on the part of European scholars, we can only recommend Professor Cullmann's treatise. We are also grateful to the author for calling our attention in an *Appendice* to the *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* by Adalbert Stauffer (Stuttgart-Berlin, 1941), which also devotes a chapter to the "first confessions" of the primitive Church indicating criteria whereby these confessional formulas may be distinguished from their context.

P. PETERS.

What Seek Ye? Sermons for the season after Christmas by pastors of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. 271 pages. Price, \$2.25. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis.

The book contains twenty-one sermons by as many authors. There are three sermons each for the first Sunday after New Year, the festival of

the Epiphany, and for each of the five Sundays after Epiphany. The majority of the contributing authors resides in the larger Twin Cities area, but some of the sermons have come from such outlying spots as South Africa and Anchorage, Alaska.

As varied as the climate in which the authors live are the sermons in this series. There are those which bear joyous testimony to the peace wrought for us by the Lamb of God. "We now sense the tremendous fact, 'It was for me He died.'" There is valiant testimony regarding the divine inspiration of the Bible. "It is not enough to consider the Bible a noble, uplifting book; it must be regarded as an absolutely errorless revelation of the divine will. The Savior, on the night in which He began to suffer for the sins of the world, declared, 'Thy word is truth.' Churches will never have the power and fire of the Holy Ghost if preachers quote Scripture with their fingers crossed."

Unfortunately the series also contains sermons which should not share the pages of this volume with the others. Why should preachers attempt to enhance the glory of the Gospel with sophisticated falderal, as when a man speaks of Zaccheus "as a member of the society of itching palms," as a "first century coupon clipper," as a "political rotter"?

More serious still is the fact that we are confronted with doctrinal errors. "When we stop resisting the working of God's Spirit . . . then God can work because we are in the condition of receptivity. When a child is brought to God in Holy Baptism, the Holy Spirit . . . meets no resistance or selfrighteousness in the child's heart and is able to enter that heart and impart a new life, to justify, to regenerate, and to make that child a member of the kingdom."

While such preaching must call forth earnest disapproval, we can truthfully say that there are many pages of enjoyable, interesting reading in this book.

A. SCHALLER.

That You May Know. A study in the Gospel according to St. Luke.

Ernest B. Steen. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis 15, Minnesota. Price, \$1.00.

The title page states that this is "one of a series of courses issued under the auspices of the Board of Parish Education for high school Bible departments." It is a workbook which should prove helpful in directing and stimulating students to a thorough study of St. Luke's Gospel. A classroom situation where extensive preparation on the part of the student can be expected is presupposed. In thirty-six lessons the student learns to see how fully and clearly St. Luke fulfills the purpose which was before him when he first wrote his inspired Gospel for Theophilus: "That thou mightest know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed." Through the means of guiding information, ques-

tions, assignments, diagrams, illustrations, and maps the student is in each lesson guided at his preparation in noting and understanding the facts and truths of a portion of the Gospel, in grasping their meaning for Christian faith and life, and in seeing how they serve to further and fulfill the purpose of the entire Gospel. The knowledge to be gained by the student from the Gospel, together with Theophilus, is summed up at the end as including such knowledge as: "The facts about the life and work of Jesus Christ; the experience that Jesus was their Savior from sin and the Lord of their lives; the added experience of being sure of one's salvation in Christ."

C. J. L.

Am Krankenbette, by H. M. Zorn. Concordia Publishing House.
Price, 15 cents.

A set of meditations for the sick, in leaflet form. Being written in German, they offer a valuable aid particularly to our younger pastors in ministering to those of their members who still prefer that language. In their form they are adorations, in which the soul addresses itself to its God in prayerful meditation. For this reason they will be more in character when read by the patient himself than when read or spoken to him by the pastor. The contents are thoroughly evangelical, the language beautiful.

E. R.

The Death of Christ. By William Dallmann, D. D. A tract of 28 pages.
Price, 25 cents. Northwestern Publishing House.

This is the second edition of the tract.

Of the death of Christ the author says truly that it "Is God's greatest work, the heart of Christianity. And so the Bible preaches Christ crucified, the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth" (p. 2). A wealth of Scripture passages and hymn verses is presented under the following three heads: "1. The Redemption of a Surety. — 2. The Reconciliation of an Ambassador. — 3. The Sacrifice of a Priest." M.

Be Baptized! Tract No. 155. By John Theodore Mueller, Th. D.,
15 pages.

We Baptize Children. Tract No. 157. Same size. By same author.
Both tracts are put out by the Concordia Publishing House at the price of 15 cents.

Regarding the first named a reminder may be in place that the *Didache* does not "prescribe" the mode of sprinkling (p. 10), but permits it. The words: "Pour water three times on the head" are preceded by the conditional clause: *ean de amphotera mē echēs*, namely neither *hydōr zōn* nor *allo hydōr*, either cold or warm. In that case "pouring" is indicated. — Under the heading "The Blessings of Holy Baptism" Mk. 16, 16, should

not have been omitted, the very passage which Luther uses in his Small Catechism as summarizing the promises of God concerning the blessings of the sacrament. M.

Above the Tumult in China. By Clara J. Jones, illustrated by Edward Sovik, published by Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, 1948.

The unraveling of seven years in China as portrayed in this book was made possible, to a large extent, because of the diary of the authoress. In turning to these records this missionary worker of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church made the book factual. Especially the first chapter with its gripping portrayal of the sufferings of the Chinese people during World War II will convince the reader of this. One of the closing chapters, *An Hour in China's Millenniums*, offers a brief survey of China's history climaxed with the expression of hope: "A new China is in the making." The present struggle between the Republican and Communistic forces is not included in this survey. Whatever the outcome of this struggle may be, the prediction of the authoress is undoubtedly more correct than she herself could have foreseen: "A new China is in the making."

P. PETERS.

Vacation Bible School Workbooks. First Series. Prepared under the auspices of the Board for Parish Education Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio and Other States. Editor: Arthur W. Gross. 1947. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri.

Manual for Vacation Bible School, 75 cents net, postpaid.

Bringing Good News, Beginner Department, 55 cents net, postpaid.

Telling the Story of Jesus, Primary Department, 55 cents net, postpaid.

Finding and Sharing Jesus, Junior Department, 45 cents net, postpaid.

Messengers for God, Senior Department, 45 cents net, postpaid.

Vacation Bible School Workbooks. Second Series. Prepared under the auspices of the Board for Parish Education of the Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod. Editor: Arthur W. Gross. 1948. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri.

We Learn About God, Beginner Department, 30 cents.

Our Heavenly Father, Primary Department, 38 cents.

The God We Worship, Junior Department, 38 cents.

The One Eternal God, Senior Department, 38 cents.

Manual for Vacation Bible Schools, 50 cents.

Handicraft Projects for Vacation Bible Schools, Beginner, Primary, Junior, Senior, each 20 cents.

He Will Abundantly Pardon. Radio messages of the second part of the thirteenth Lutheran Hour, by Walter A. Maier. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri, 1948. A. SCHALLER.

Quartalschrift

Theological Quarterly

Volume 46

July, 1949

Number 3

CLOSING ADDRESS

June 2, 1949

SEMINARY, THIENSVILLE, WISCONSIN

Dt. 33, 29: Happy art thou, O Israel; who is like unto thee, O people saved by the Lord, the shield of thy help, and who is the sword of thy excellency! And thine enemies shall be found liars unto thee, and thou shalt tread upon their high places.

Dear Members of the Graduating Class:

In our text Moses calls the Children of Israel a "happy" people. The same can be said about the people whom you have prepared yourselves to serve. They are Christians, whom the Holy Ghost gathered into the Church. The Church is a happy people, and every member is a blessed and happy person.

What does that mean for your office? Is it merely an interesting fact to be noted? or should it have some influence on the manner in which you conduct your office? Ponder this fact often, and it will stimulate you to greater diligence and to a better performance of your work. Remember, you are

Serving A Happy People

First consider on what grounds Moses calls the Children of Israel a happy people. Consider in what the happiness of your Christians consists. You will find that *God Himself made them happy through His salvation.*

Moses uses one word in our text which explains it all. He says: "saved by the Lord." This applied to the people of Israel even outwardly. They had been in Egypt. There they had been kept in bondage. They were made to slave for Pharaoh; and if

they did not perform their assigned task to his satisfaction they were beaten unmercifully. Also their newborn sons were cast into the river. The Children of Israel were powerless against this oppression. They could not resist, nor could they escape.

Then God with ten plagues humbled haughty Pharaoh, so that he released Israel. With a mighty hand God divided the waters of the Red Sea so that Israel could pass through dryshod, while the pursuing Egyptian hosts were swallowed by the resurging waves. In a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night God led His people on the way through the wilderness. He fed them with manna from heaven and gave them water out of the rock. He protected them against mighty enemies who opposed them in battle. In our text Moses calls the Lord "the shield of thy help" and "the sword of thy excellency." He says: "Thine enemies shall be found liars unto thee," *i. e.*, they shall cringe before you and curry favor. He says: "Thou shalt tread upon their high places."

This was only an outward saving. Could that make Israel truly happy? No, but this outward saving pointed to the real saving which God prepared for His people. It helped to assure them of it and also to bring it nearer to its fulfillment.

On the way to Canaan God led the people to Mt. Sinai, where He renewed the covenant with them which He had made with their fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, when He promised them that in their seed all the families of the earth should be blessed. It was the old promise which God had given immediately after the fall when He announced that the Seed of the woman should crush the head of the serpent. Only by giving the Law to His people God outwardly placed them under "tutors and governors."

The fulfillment of this covenant came when God in the fulness of time sent forth His only begotten Son into the world to carry out the work of redemption. Jesus secured a real salvation, a complete reconciliation. Israel under Moses was saved from the wrath of Pharaoh, Jesus redeemed us from the wrath of God. Pharaoh's wrath could do no more than kill the body, God's wrath can destroy body and soul in hell.

See what Jesus did. He took the wrath of God upon Himself. He suffered and died for us. But notice how in all this

He won the Father's heart for us. He stood in our stead. Ponder what He did as our representative.

See how He prays to the Father. God wants us to call upon Him in spirit and in truth, as dear children call upon their dear father. Look at Jesus prostrate in the Garden Gethsemane. He pours out His heart before His Father: Can the Father not find a way for Him that He may be spared the bitter cup? If not, He is willing to drink it. "Not my will, but thine, be done." Such childlike prayer pleases God. — And remember, that was you and I praying thus before God in Gethsemane.

God desires that we love our fellow men, even our enemies. See what Jesus did in our stead. He did not revile again when He was reviled, He did not even threaten when He suffered. He committed all things to His Father in the prayer: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Could the Father's heart remain untouched by such love? — Again it was you and I whom God there saw loving our enemies.

God wants us to commit our ways trustingly to Him, cling to Him, whether we know where He is leading us, or not; follow Him even when the way is painful beyond measure. In such faith He delights. Now see how Jesus' faith was put to the test. All around Him was outer darkness. The agony of hell seized Him. Even God had forsaken Him. He knew not what it was all about. He could not see His Father nor feel Him; yet He called: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" That perfect faith in outer darkness won the Father's heart and completely removed all traces of wrath against us.

More must be said about God's saving His people. Abraham, the father of Israel, is called the father of believers. That was the outstanding trait of his character that he believed God. Where did he get his faith? It was not his by nature. God created it in his heart, nourished it and trained it.

When God called Abraham out of his father's house, then by that very call He kindled the faith in Abraham to accept and follow the call. Abraham's faith was not strong and vigorous at the beginning. In his history we see how he mixed many fleshly ideas with his faith. We also see that he experienced

relapses. But God was with him, helped him to overcome his weaknesses and to recover from his lapses.

The same we observe in the Children of Israel. They heard the call of God through Moses, yet the story of their forty years of wandering in the wilderness is one unbroken chain of murmurings and backslidings. A stiffnecked people. Yet God did not forsake them. By severe means and by unusual manifestations of patience and loving-kindness He trained them to appreciate their salvation. — Happy art thou, Moses says.

The same applies to us, who not by our own reason or strength came to Jesus nor believe in Him. God gave us His Holy Spirit, who created faith in our hearts, and when in our battles against our inborn sin we weakened He strengthened us, and when we stumbled He raised us up again and comforted us with the forgiveness of our sins.

That is the kind of people which we are to serve in our ministry, a people saved by the Lord.

How careful we then must be to serve God's happy people properly!

First of all consider the condition of the people. They are a saved people, but they have not yet reached the final goal. They were spiritually very sick, yes, they were dead by nature. Now they have been restored to life, but the old germ of disease is still in them and is constantly causing them trouble. They may be compared to convalescents: they are on the way to complete recovery but are still rather weak, and a relapse is not impossible.

You know how tender a trained nurse is in the care of her patients at this stage. A little mistake might do irreparable harm. In our ministry not a physical life is at stake, or physical health, but spiritual life and eternal salvation. Careless treatment might change a happy people into a most unhappy one. Let us be careful in our ministry. Paul says to the Philippians: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." This word certainly contains also a message for us who are called to tend to the people of God. We must serve them with fear and trembling.

We must do this all the more because they are considered as very precious by God. Look what price He paid for them! If He

had redeemed us with gold and silver, we would think that He rated our value to Him in dollars and cents, perhaps thousands, perhaps millions of dollars, but in a figure that can be approached by human reason. Even in this case, the higher the cost, the higher the appreciation, and the higher the care with which we would serve such a treasure.

But the price that God paid for His people cannot be computed in dollars and cents. St. Paul expresses it in these words to the elders of Ephesus: God has appointed you as overseers to feed the flock which He purchased with His own blood. What love, what longing, what yearning for the possession of His people must have filled the heart of God if He was ready to pay this tremendous price!

Now He has entrusted to us the care of this highly treasured possession. We should feed His people, we should help them, we should teach them, we should nurse them. Can we approach our task in any other way than with fear and trembling? What, if we should make a mistake? What, if through our neglect the people should suffer harm, perhaps be lost altogether, people which God prized so highly that He purchased them with His own blood? What, if through our neglect His efforts should be wasted, His blood spent in vain?

In appointing us to shepherd His flock God has not left the choice of means to us. He Himself has provided fitting food and drink. He has established the necessary means for instruction and guidance. He has instituted the means of grace. These means, chosen by God, are perfectly suited for their purpose, and it will be our task to apply them.

Oh, how careful this consideration must make us! The Word of God, preaching Christ crucified, is to the Greeks foolishness and to the Jews a stumbling block. The temptation is ever present to modify the Word a little, to tone it down in places, to add something in others. But if anyone should yield to this temptation, he would not merely offer to God's flock an inferior food, lacking in vital elements, he would actually be feeding poison. All human alterations of the Word are poisonous.

How careful we must be in applying the Word properly! The Word consists of Law and Gospel. How easy it is to mix them,

to confuse them! How easy, *e. g.*, to insist on a certain conformity to rule where God looks for a free expression of spiritual life in His people, His happy people! How easy to fall into the error of stimulating the new obedience of God's people with the idea of reward and merit, while God wants an obedience of gratitude! How easy to pronounce the condemnation of the Law where the consoling message of the Gospel is in place! — How easy, on the other hand, to speak of God's grace and mercy to a person who does his "good" works in the strength of his own honor and his self-made character!

Faithful care of the people of God demands that we strictly abide by His Word, deviating neither to the right nor to the left. Again, this is not popular. When God warns against false prophets and asks us to mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which we have learned from Him, those that apply this warning to every error, no matter where it may occur, are frequently denounced as legalistic.

God has given us His Word, which is just right for feeding and guiding His happy people. How careful this fact must make us to preserve this Word unadulterated in proclaiming it!

Well may we ask with St. Paul: "Who is sufficient for these things?" To understand the happiness of God's people, to understand their needs, to serve them with understanding, *we must be members of God's people ourselves and must share its happiness.*

The happiness of God's people is unknown to the world. Only one who himself has tasted it can appreciate it, to all others it is foolishness.

You know in what things the children of this world seek their happiness. It may be in a coarse form in the possession of riches, of moneys, of lands, of houses, which they either boastfully display or hoard miserly. It may be by seeking the pleasure of a wild life which this world offers, eating, drinking, dancing, brawling. It may be in acquiring prestige and influence, perhaps high positions of honor with almost dictatorial powers. Or it may be in a more refined way by cultivating science and the arts. It may be in a still more refined way be leading an honest and upright life, by performing works of charity in an unostentatious way, and by devotion to the service of mankind.

Happiness of this kind the world can understand. To seek happiness in this way is in keeping with the thoughts of the common people, and is the method recommended by philosophers, both old and new. Such are the principles according to which the world would gauge the happiness of a people, and in accordance with them it would try to minister to their happiness. These same ideas dominate our own heart by nature. If left to our own devices we certainly would try to serve the happy people of God accordingly. There is such a thing as learning about the peculiar happiness of the children of God intellectually, theoretically, just as you may acquire a book knowledge about things of which you have no personal experience. It is true also that the Word of God, even if applied only mechanically, without any inner participation on our part, does not lose any of its divine power. The Gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation, whether the preacher himself believes in that power or not.

We, however, are now asking a question about ourselves, how we as ministers of God can best serve His happy people, serve them with understanding, how we can become best equipped for such service.

The answer is, Only one who is himself a member of God's happy people, one who personally shares the happiness of God's people, can do so. He knows from bitter experience what it means to be separated from God by sin. He knows how futile all efforts are to shake off the yoke of sin by our own reason or strength. He has tasted the love of Christ, who gave Himself for our sins. He knows the power of the Holy Spirit to create faith and new life in a sin-infested heart. He knows how the love of Christ and the power of the Spirit flow into our heart through the channel of the Word and the Sacraments. He knows the peace and joy which the forgiveness of sins brings.

He also knows that in this life our happiness is not unalloyed. The Old Adam is still in our heart, struggling against the spirit. He knows how many and how ugly wounds and gashes the enemy may inflict. He knows how often and how deep we may fall into sin. But he also knows that God is ever ready to raise us up again, to assure us of His abiding grace. On the basis of his own experience he can understand the heart of God's people and

can apply the Word of God for nourishment, for comfort, for warning, for rebuke, as the occasion may require.

Of the three factors which Luther mentioned as fundamental I should today like to stress the third, *tentatio*, experience, in urging: be sober, be vigilant. Study the Scriptures for your own edification. Draw from the Scriptures a constant nourishment of your own faith, new energy for faithfulness in your work, new strength for your battles against sin, new comfort from the never changing grace of our God and Savior.

Learn to enjoy the happiness of God's people, and you will thereby become all the better equipped to serve the flock of God's happy people entrusted to your care. Amen. M.

LETTERS ADDRESSED TO LUTHERAN PASTORS

BY PROFESSOR HERMANN SASSE

II

Concerning the Nature of Confession in the Church

(Translation by E. Reim)

Dear Brethren in the Ministry:

Reactions to my first letter have been so friendly that now, at the close of the Old Year, I venture to follow it up with a second. It is meant to set forth a few basic ideas concerning the *nature of confession in the Church*. This is material that the author has already at least in part presented for discussion in the form of printed essays or lectures, and which he hopes to supplement by a more comprehensive work as soon as the time comes when Lutheran theological literature can again be published.

That the Evangelical Lutheran Church is a confessional church in the strict sense of the word, and that it ceases to be the Church of the Lutheran *Reformation* as soon as it ceases to be the Church of the Lutheran Confessions, that is a matter which admits of no doubt. Here our opponents often see better than we Lutherans when, awed by the constantly repeated charge of

“confessionalism,” we try to show that we are not so bad after all. One could fill an entire page with the terms of reproach that have been heaped upon us from the dawn of Pietism down to the days of the German *Kirchenkampf* (lit. church-fight), yes, which we must hear in an even stronger degree in our day because we are a confessional church, a church that takes seriously the confessions of the Fathers and dares to obligate its pastors to these confessions *because (quia)* they agree with the Word of God.

If one surveys this unending contumely, if one seeks to understand the passionate nature of the polemics that are directed against this Lutheran confessionalism and which equal the bitterness with which the several confessions fought with each other in the Era of Orthodoxy, then one begins to ask whether these are not more than human forces which are here assailing the Lutheran Church. This is comparable to the attacks launched against the Church of the Augsburg Confession in the 16th century, which are not to be explained as the result of merely human passions and human opinions. So much the more it now becomes our solemn duty not merely to understand the confession which we are called to defend, but increasingly and more deeply to comprehend just what is the nature of a true confession and what are its functions in the Church.

1.

What better source for instruction concerning the nature of the Church's confession can we find than the *New Testament*? Here we at once make an extremely important observation, namely that the same words which correspond with our “confess” and the Latin *confiteri*, the words *homologeïn* and *exhomologeisthai*, have several distinct meanings which nevertheless are basically related: *the confessing of sin* (1 John 1:9, Matt. 3:6, James 5:16), *the confessing of faith* (Matt. 10:32, John 9:22, Romans 10:9, 1 John 2:23; 4:2, Phil. 2:11, etc., cf. 2 Cor. 9:13, Hebrews 3:1; 4:14, etc.) and *the praising of God* (e. g., Matt. 11:25, Romans 14:11).

In the Church all three types of “confessing” belong inseparably together, even as history shows. The “*Te Deum laudamus, Te Dominum confitemur,*” which Luther used to love

to count as one of the ecumenical confessions of the Church, was sung by a church that was repenting for the sins of mankind amidst the ruins of the ancient world. The *Confessiones* of Augustine are praises of God, but also confessions of faith and confessions of the sin in his life. Because the Reformation began as a penitential movement and according to its innermost nature was such a movement in fact, a movement that concerned itself about true repentance and the justification of sinners, therefore, and only therefore, it was able to produce confessions of faith and to sing a new song of praise to God in its liturgies and hymns. Paul Gerhardt and the other great hymn writers of our church could sing the praise of God as no other generation. But it was not *in spite*, but rather *because* of the fact that they were orthodox men and contenders for orthodoxy.

It is no mere coincidence that the end of the 17th century, when men were no longer taking the *doctrine* of faith seriously, also witnessed the departure of the confessional from Lutheran churches and at the same time the silencing of its great hymns of praise and thanksgiving. When will men stop this idle talk about "dead Orthodoxy," a charge that is completely without historical foundation, resting only on a dogma of Pietism, — for Pietism has also had its dogmas, and some very obvious ones at that. This connection between confession of sins, confession of faith, and the praise of God could be demonstrated as occurring in other denominations as well, *e. g.*, in the Catholic Church of the Middle Ages, whose great theologians were also great liturgists, or in the Eastern Church where "orthodoxy" has always meant both the true doctrine and the true praise of God.

Nevertheless, it would be entirely wrong to proceed from this connection to the conclusion which is so often drawn today, namely that it is enough if the Church worships God with glorious hymns and liturgies, and that the Creed is only a part of the Liturgy. Many modern Protestants are perfectly willing to join in singing those old hymns of praise which glorify the Incarnation of the eternal Son of God or the divine mystery of the Trinity. But that does not yet mean that they accept these respective articles of faith as true. In addition to their liturgical function, therefore, these Creeds have another side, according to which they serve as

formulations of doctrine. And this dare not be surrendered. In Heaven this confession will indeed be purely an act of praise (Phil. 2:11, also the great hymns of the Apocalypse). For in heaven there will be no more error, no more heresies, and Anti-christ, who leads men into misbelief and unbelief, will finally be overcome.

But here on earth the praise of God with its implied confession of belief in Him is accompanied by a declaring of the content of this faith, of simple judgment of fact, of articles of faith which the believer holds to be true. "Born of the Virgin Mary," "of one essence with the Father," — those are statements that one cannot pray and cannot sing unless one believes them to be true, even as one should not sing, "Blest and Holy Trinity, Praise forever be to Thee!" if one no longer believes this doctrine. The fact that modern Protestants do this nevertheless is a symptom of the decline of the evangelical churches and explains the greater strength of Catholicism. There is no church on earth without a real confession that it takes seriously. The Liturgy itself is an outgrowth of such a confession, and the Pope was perfectly right when in his encyclical *Mediator Dei* he reminded the liturgical movement of the Roman Church that the familiar dictum "*Lex supplicandi lex credendi*" not only can but must be inverted. Just as it is certain that in the history of the Church a dogma is usually first prayed and then defined as an article of faith, just so certainly the Liturgy is preceded by confession of faith in the original Church.

2.

How after all, according to the testimony of the New Testament, did the creedal confession of the Church of Christ originate? Did scholarly theologians give free rein to their desire for metaphysical definition or to their delight in theological formulas and undertake to put the ineffable mystery of His person into human words, rather than being satisfied to be simple followers of their Lord? Did the disciples assemble for a theological conference in the manner of modern conventions of theologians and draw up a compromise formula which is meant to state the points at which their different theological convictions were found in agreement? Or were they concerned about creating a liturgical

formulary? Why did not some "*carmen Christi*" become the basic creed of the Church? For according to the testimony of St. Paul there were many such hymns, ever since the days of the first Hellenistic churches.

The reason is that the formation of creeds did not begin because of the initiative of men, but because of the will and deed of the Lord of the Church. It was Jesus Christ Himself who asked His disciples, "Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?" and who then held them to the question with a request for an answer that would admit of no other interpretation: "But whom do ye say that I am?" Because of this question from the sixteenth chapter of Matthew, which was repeated in another form, Matth. 22:42, it is Jesus Himself who originated the formation of creeds and who therefore, if one will have it so, is the founder of Christian dogmatics. For so Paul (1 Tim. 6:13) speaks of "Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession," namely by the answer He gave to this human judge who inquired who He might be, an answer which, as the words indicate, also made Him the first "martyr."

Therefore the Church's confession is in its innermost nature an answer to a question. It is the answer of faith to the question which is posed by the appearance of Jesus Christ (*die Offenbarung Jesu Christi*), the question: Who is He? No one else than Jesus Himself puts this question to us. He addresses it to all men who are reached by His Gospel: to His disciples as well as to the Church of every century; to the great thinkers, the philosophers and the historians of every age as well as to the little child that is just learning to fold its hands and pray, "Come, Lord Jesus!"; to the Christians of the ancient churches as well as to those people who in some mission field are hearing this message for the first time.

No man can escape giving an answer to this question, be that answer what it may. And the confessions of the Church seek to be nothing more than an answer to that same question. And that is true of all confessions, the simple formulas which were sufficient for the Primitive Church, the creeds of ecclesiastical antiquity, the symbolical writings of the various confessional churches of the Reformation period which sought, each in its

own way, to safeguard against false interpretations the original confession by which the Church acknowledges Jesus as the Christ. Every confession of the Church is first and last an answer, not to some human inquiry, but to the question of the Lord who asks, "Who am I?"

3.

"But who say *ye* that I am?" That is the question which the Lord addressed to His disciples as a group. And when Peter voices the deepest conviction of his personal faith, saying, "Thou art the Christ," then he was speaking in the name of all. The same Peter declared, John 6:69, "We believe and are sure that Thou art the Holy One of God." This is the second mark of a true church confession. It is always a confession of the faith that dwells in the heart of an individual. And yet (note the "we") it is the confession of many, an expression of the great consensus of the Church.

The *credo* of the Baptismal Confession and the *pisteuomen* of the symbols of the synods and the early liturgical creeds all belong together. How does it happen that Peter could declare the faith of those others without first consulting them? How could Melancthon dare to begin the Augustana with the words, "*Ecclesiae magno consensu apud nos docent,*" without some synod first having established this *consensus*? How does it happen that the constantly reiterated "We believe, teach, and confess" of the Formula of Concord met with such a powerful response? Not every confession has been thus received. Only a few of the ancient symbols have been accepted by the Church. But where it did occur, it was with the conviction that there the great "We" of the Church, of the entire church of the true faith, was really speaking.

This juxtaposition and interplay of "I" and "We" is something that is beyond the comprehension of modern man with his individualism. We modern Protestants can think of the genesis of a creed only in such a way that a large number of individuals assemble and formulate a confession in which a minimum of creedal statements are made, namely those in which all agree. That is how modern "confessions," which finally are

nothing but the constitutive articles of some religious organization, come into being.

But the confession of the Church is of a different origin. "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father which is in heaven." That is the answer of Jesus to the confession of Peter. "No one can say: 'Jesus is *Kyrios*', except in the Holy Spirit." So speaks St. Paul 1 Cor. 12:3. "Let us love one another, so that we may confess in unity of faith," so the Creed is introduced in the Liturgy of the Eastern Church. "I believe that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ, my Lord, nor come to Him; but the Holy Ghost has called *me* by the Gospel, . . . in like manner as He calls, gathers, enlightens, and sanctifies *the whole Christian Church* on earth, and keeps it with Jesus Christ in the one true faith," says Luther. Truly to believe and confess is therefore one and the same thing in the case of a single believer as well as the entire Church, since in either case it is the work of the Holy Ghost. That is the secret of the consensus of the Church of Christ. In this sense a confession which answers the question implied in the revelation of the Gospel is *the answer of that communion of the Church which the Spirit has created*.

4.

A confession that is so understood has two functions, or to speak more correctly, a double function: to *gather*, and to *separate*. The latter purpose of the confessions, which is so often placed into the foreground, namely to exclude error from the Church, is merely the counterpart of its function of gathering. *The Church congregates around the confession.*

It may be said, indeed is said again and again, that thereby one is placing too high an evaluation on confession; that the true Church does not gather around a creed but around the Holy Scriptures. Of course the Church gathers around Scripture, but around a Scripture that is rightly understood. For all churches gather around Scripture as such, even all heresies. But by answering the Gospel question as to the person of Jesus the Confession sets forth the true understanding of Scripture in contrast to the heretic's understanding of the same Scripture.

The Church of the Apostles was understanding its Old Testament Scriptures correctly when it saw in Jesus the true Messiah. Thus the early Church gathered around the confession, "Jesus is the Christ," and at the same time separated itself from the Synagogue: "For the Jews had agreed already, that if any man did confess that He was Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue" (John 9:22). If any doubt remained as to whether or not it were possible to confess Christ in the Synagogue, this was removed when this first creed was expanded into the statement that "Jesus Christ is the *Kyrios*," the confession around which gathered the congregations of Paul. For "*Kyrios*" is the term by which God revealed Himself. In the Greek version of the Old Testament it stood for the Hebrew name of God. Thus the Church was definitely separated from the Synagogue, but at the same time also from the Hellenistic mystery religions which designated their cultic deities as *kyrioi* and from the cult of the Roman State with its *kyrios Kaisar*.

When by the end of the first century Gnosticism entered the Church and entire sections of earliest Christendom, like Syria and Egypt, were alienated by it, when paganism in the guise of an allegedly purer, more spiritual type of Christianity invaded the Church and gained what may well have been a majority of Christians for its views, then the Church of the true faith gathered around creeds that confessed the Incarnation. And it was the Apostle of Love, John, who used this confession to exclude these heresies from the Church. Although this involved men who certainly also believed in Jesus, who only sought to do Him greater honor by denying the fleshly reality of His body, yet he dared to designate them as false prophets, yes, as anti-Christ, and even to deny his Christians the right to bid them God-speed (1 John 4:1ff.; 2 John 7ff.). And so one might continue in the history of doctrine. The gathering of the true Church and the elimination of heresy, that was the objective of all the great doctrinal pronouncements of the Ancient Church as well as of the Reformation.

And, as is usually the case in this world of sin, truth and error are not easy to distinguish, the difficulty increasing in the same degrees as it is a higher truth that is at stake. Whether lone

Jeremiah, foretelling the doom of Jerusalem, was sent by God, or whether it was the other prophets who were proclaiming the wonderful deliverance of the city, but whom Jeremiah was characterizing as lying prophets, — who in Jerusalem could tell this with certainty at that time? It was a matter of faith, of a false faith in a so-called Word of God, or of true faith in the genuine Word of God. To recognize the true Word of God and to accept it in faith, that is, according to the testimony of the New Testament, a gift of the Holy Spirit. But a true understanding of Scripture is also achieved only by the help of the Holy Spirit. For in this world where the “Father of Lies” seeks to deceive men, even the true word of God is subject to false interpretation.

Therefore the Church dare never cease to pray: “Lord, keep us steadfast in Thy Word”; “Lord, keep us in Thy Truth.” It knows that it does not ask this in vain. For someone else is praying with and for the church; the merciful High Priest who in His last night on earth prayed for His Church, not only that it might be one, but that it might be one *in the truth*” (John 17:17): “Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth.” Upon this prayer of Jesus Christ, and upon this alone, rests our assurance that in spite of the fallibility of men and the capacity of Christians for being led into error, the Church cannot lose the truth if it continues in the Word and recognizes nothing but the Word alone.

The history of the Church provides tragic evidence to show what happens when in addition to the Word and beside the Holy Scriptures other sources of revelation are recognized. The outstanding example of this process is Rome. As soon as the Council of Trent placed tradition beside Scripture as an equivalent source of revelation, there began a development that became increasingly fateful with the passing of the centuries, and which may best be observed in the development of Mariology and the cult of Mary. From the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception to the cult of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, then to the dogma of her bodily assumption into Heaven which will in all likelihood be proclaimed in the Holy Year of 1950, and on to the doctrine of Mary as the “Mediatrice of every grace,” which has already been conceded in the Liturgy and which according to Karl Adam is approaching the status of a dogma, and then to the cults of Lourdes and Fatima

which are half if not entirely pagan, and which are hardly distinguishable from the cult of the great mother-goddesses of the ancient pagan world — what an evolution!

Yet it is nothing for us Protestants to rejoice in. There is, after all, such a thing as a solidarity of all Christendom. We too must pay for the sins of Rome, even as Rome must suffer for ours. That is true even though we may not know why. We cannot witness this tragedy except with deepest sorrow and a prayer which is so much the more fervent; "Lord, keep us steadfast in Thy Word." May we the more earnestly search the Scriptures, even concerning the Scriptural mystery of Mary, as Luther so beautifully did on the basis of Biblical statements in his interpretation of the Magnificat and in his sermons for the ancient Mary festivals, which after all are Christ festivals. In the same spirit of greater earnestness we must study the Nicene Creed with its "*Et incarnatus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine, et homo factus est,*" as Karl Barth has done in his own way, in the chapter on "The Miracle of Christmas" in his *Dogmatik*, a chapter which could well serve as an example for many a Lutheran textbook on dogmatics. Nowhere have we a better opportunity to note what is an ecclesiastical confession in the highest sense of the word than in Luther's explanation of the Second Article, this most beautiful sentence in the German language, as it has been called. This explanation is nothing less than a clear, unrefuted and irrefutable interpretation of the Holy Bible, a classic answer to the question of Jesus Christ, "Who am I?"

5.

What has been said makes it clear how senseless, how unjust is the charge which we Lutherans must hear ever again, namely that — not in theory, but in practice — we let the confessions outrank the Holy Scriptures. This charge is explained in part by the positiveness which the Lutheran Church holds that if the Bible is understood in the light of the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*, the article of justification by faith alone, it is not a book sealed with seven seals which calls for the interpretation of an infallible ministry (*Lehramt*), but that, to speak with our fathers, it is *sui ipsius interpres* for those who read and hear it in the power

of the Holy Spirit. We are definitely of the conviction that in this sense the Bible is clear and intelligible and therefore there is a Confession of the Church which does give expression to the true understanding of Scripture. In this sense our church ascribes something to its confessions, in so far as they judge teachings and make doctrinal decisions on the basis of clear passages of Scripture: not infallibility, but rather a correctness which can be effectively challenged only by the proof that Scripture has been falsely interpreted.

Here lies the most profound difference over against the conception of a confession which prevails in the *Reformed* Church, particularly during the last century, a difference which unfortunately has not been given sufficient attention in the current debates on confessionalism. For between these two great Protestant faiths (*evangelischen Konfessionen*) there is not merely a difference as to the content of their confessions, but in their basic understanding of what constitutes a confession. Karl Barth has expressed the Reformed conception in the following definition in which he seeks to show wherein it differs from the Lutheran view: "A Reformed confession is a setting forth of the understanding that *for the time being* has been given to the universal Christian church concerning that revelation of God in Jesus Christ which is given only in Scripture, an understanding that has been formulated spontaneously and publicly by a *locally circumscribed* communion of Christians (von einer örtlich umschriebenen christlichen Gemeinschaft), which *until further developments* is definitive for its external relations and which *until further developments* guides its doctrine and life." (*Wünschbarkeit und Möglichkeit eines allgemeinen reformierten Glaubensbekenntnisses*, reprinted in *Die Theologie und die Kirche*. Gesammelte Vorträge, 2. Band, 1928.)

Much of what has been said here can be accepted by Lutherans also. The points of difference we have indicated by our emphasis. Why should a confession have only a locally circumscribed validity if it gives expression to an understanding of Scriptural truth which has been granted to the universal Church? Why should it be valid only until further developments, only for the time being, if it expresses Scriptural truths which are valid

for all times? It is a historical fact that the Reformed Church operates only with confessions of local validity, the Heidelberg Catechism for Germany, the Helvetica for Switzerland, the Gallicana for the Reformed areas of France, the Belgica for those of the Netherlands, the Scotica for Scotland, etc. This is in marked contrast to Lutheranism where the Augustana and the Book of Concord are valid for the entire Lutheran Church of the world.

How is this "*ubique*" of the Lutheran Confessions to be explained? Is it that *hybris* which makes human statements of doctrine absolute, or is it not simply the conviction that the teachings of Scripture are the same for all people and places? And what about the "for the time being," the "until further developments"? Is it really only a subordinating of the confessions to Scripture that leads to what Barth has called a "devout and free relativism" in this problem of the confessions? Or does this not conceal secret doubts as to the perspicuity of the Scriptures, and not merely the justifiable doubts as to the reliability of men? What has come out of the "for the time being" and the "until further developments" of the Reformed conception of a confession? Does this not explain what is also deeply deplored by Reformed theologians, namely that in the 19th century Reformed churches have arbitrarily invalidated the confessions of the Church, of the Ancient Church as well as those of the Reformation, so that at Basel for instance, the adherents and the opponents of the doctrine of the Trinity have equal status?

When pastors are pledged to the Holy Scripture alone, as is done in many Reformed churches, and it is left to them whether their teaching will be Unitarian or Trinitarian, is this a return to the reverence which we owe to Scripture? Should we not on the basis of our experience in Germany — for instance in the completely non-confessional Church of Bremen — realize that it is only the *norma normata* of the confessions which shows due respect to the *norma normans* of the Holy Scriptures? The entire experience of modern church history shows that as soon as the authority of the confessions as the true interpretation of Scripture is weakened, the *norma normans* of the Holy Scriptures is also overthrown. Therefore in the Lutheran Church the authority of the confessions is nothing else than the authority of the Holy

Scripture which is *sui ipsius interpret*. Here lies the basic reason why the Lutheran Church pledges its ministers upon the confession because (*quia*) "it has been taken from God's Word and is founded firmly and well therein" (FC Sol. Decl. Comprehensive Summary, III.) and not only in so far (*quatenus*) they agree with Scripture, as is customary in Reformed churches. The "*quia*" presupposes a firm faith in the Holy Scripture and its perspicuity.

6.

Nothing is further from the truth than to claim that there is an affinity between the Lutheran conception of its confessions and the Catholic concept of tradition. Yet this has been done by people who consider themselves Lutherans and some even who hold the office of Lutheran bishops. The Catholic concept of tradition thinks of tradition as a source and norm of revelation standing on a par with the Bible. Our church knows nothing of that. This fateful misunderstanding, (viz. of equating confessional fidelity with the spirit of traditionalism. — Tr.) is obviously due to the fact that our church takes history seriously, that it knows something of the history of the Church. It knows that all heresies are recurrent. That is why the First Article of the Augustana is so much in earnest about the ancient heresies. Arianism had, of course, been condemned by the Council of Nicea, but it came back, and will reappear in a constant succession of new forms until the end of the world. The same thing is true of Nestorianism and Monophysitism, of Pelagianism, and all the other really great and dangerous heresies of Christendom. At Amsterdam there was a neat little rendezvous of these heresies, and they continue to thrive in the Evangelical Church in Germany and the United Ev. Luth. Church of Germany, yes even in our Lutheran Territorial Churches (*Landeskirchen*).

The controversy of the churches which was to bring about the elimination of heresy did not change this in the least. In the Rhineland certain Territorial Churches and "Free Churches," which here means Baptists, Methodists, and other groups of enthusiasts, engage jointly in a community-wide youth mission under the benison of their "Fraternal Council" (*Bruderrat*).

Lutherans who raised an unheeded voice of protest are being derided as confessional "monomaniacs." No, there is no such thing as voluntary abdication of heresies, because the Father of Lies does not abdicate.

That is the deeper reason why the Lutheran Church preserves its continuity with the Church of all the ages. The Church of Luther is still the Church of Athanasius, and the Lutheran Church of today, provided it has not forgotten and surrendered its Lutheran heritage, is still the Church of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession. That is why we do not recognize the "for the time being" and the "until further developments" of the Confessional Church of Karl Barth. That is why the symbolical writings of our church as they have been assembled in the Book of Concord of 1580 include the confessions of the orthodox Church of all the ages from the Apostles' Creed down to the Formula of Concord. That is why our pastors are pledged to these confessions, not to every statement that is made in the argumentation, not to every detail of exegesis, but to the doctrinal affirmations that they contain, because according to our profound conviction which has been confirmed by earnest and continued study they have been "taken from God's Word" and are "founded firmly and well therein." For no other declarations belong into the confessions of the Church — nor are they found there.

Thus the Confession not only unites the present generation, but also the orthodox Church of all times. Not only are we united in the fellowship of the Church and in the consensus of the true faith with those who are living today, but also with those who before us confessed the true faith and those who will do so after us, with all the believers from the beginning of the Church until the Last Day, from the confessors of the *ecclesia militans* on earth to those who in heaven are glorifying Christ in a confession that now has become purely a praising of God. That is the most profound meaning of Lutheran Confession.

7.

But our presentation would be incomplete if we were not to consider one last feature that the Lutheran Confession has in common with that of the New Testament. That is its *eschatological*

quality: "Since now, in the sight of God and of all Christendom we wish to testify to those now living and those who shall come after us that this declaration herewith presented concerning all the controverted articles aforementioned and explained, and no other, is our faith, doctrine, and confession, in which we are also willing, by God's grace, to appear with intrepid hearts before the judgment-seat of Jesus Christ, and give an account of it." (FC Sol. Decl., Conclusion.)

Is this spoken out of the false security of an arrogant orthodoxy? Are we here faced with a decadent Lutheranism that has gone beyond the humbleness of the Reformation? No! Here speaks not the false *securitas* of human confidence, but the *certitudo* of a God-given faith. Thus Luther made his confession when at the request of his Elector he formulated the Smalcald Articles, the articles upon which he intended to stand even in the face of the last judgment. That is how in his Great Confession of 1528 he gave a detailed account of his faith, in the face of death: "Upon which I intend to stand until death, so that in this faith I may, with the help of God, depart from this world and come before the judgment seat of our Lord Jesus Christ." Again we ask, is this a false security, the misguided self-confidence of Luther as an exegete? Once more we must answer: No! Here also Luther is the faithful exponent of the New Testament where all confessing, where every true confession has an eschatological character. In the face of death, before a human judge who has the power of decision over life and death, confession is made here on earth in the power of the Holy Ghost (Matt. 10:18ff.).

Whoever makes his confession concerning Jesus as Christ and Lord is putting his entire earthly existence at stake, is literally risking his life. That is the normal state of affairs. But he is not merely standing before an earthly judge, but before the Judge of Heaven. A confessor is constantly standing at the boundary between time and eternity, between eternal life and eternal death. The Confessors of the Ancient Church knew this well. And they knew something else. As a confession of faith reaches from time to eternity so the confession of faith made here on earth finds its continuation in heaven. The Author of our faith (1 Tim. 6:12, cp. Hebrews 3:1) is also its Finisher: "Whosoever therefore

shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven" (Matt. 10:32, cp. Rev. 3:5). This confessing of Christ goes beyond all human understanding, as is indicated by the "Blessed art thou" which He addressed to the first Confessor. Just as there is not only a praying on earth, but a prayer of the Lord of the Church before His Father in Heaven (e. g. John 17), so also there is not only a confessing of the Church on earth, but also a confessing of the Lord of the Church in heaven. Only when we shall have heard this Confession, and shall know what it means to be included in it, only then will we know fully what the Confession of the Church on earth is, the answer of the Church, the great "We" that embraces heaven and earth, to the Gospel of Christ.

* * * *

These are some thoughts about the Biblical and Lutheran concept of confession in the Church. Much more might be said particularly about the corruption which this concept of confession has suffered at the hands of modern Protestants. But enough of this! Let us now confess our own faith with renewed joy and vigor, even as did our Lutheran Fathers. Let us not be ashamed to be a confessional Lutheran Church. Let us not forfeit the great heritage of our fathers for this mess of pottage, the views that modern man may happen to have about Confession, concerning which he himself does not know how it will look a year or even a week from now. For us fidelity to the Confession means nothing else than to be true to the Word of God. To adhere to the Confession means nothing else with us than to adhere to the Word of God. And in this sense the poor, forlorn, despised, and derided Lutheran Church may apply this word to itself: "Stand by the Word, then you will stand where the Word stands."

PRAYER FELLOWSHIP

Essay read before the Minnesota District Pastoral Conference
assembled in New Ulm, April 26-28, by Joh. P. Meyer.

“Our Father who art in heaven.”

In prayer we appear before God, we address God, we speak to God. In joint prayer two or more persons appear before God to speak to Him, not merely simultaneously, but in a common cause. They appeal to the same God and on common premises. If one of the praying persons believes in the Triune God while the other denies the deity of the Son, or reduces the Spirit to the level of a divine influence or power, joint prayer is impossible. They may say “Our Father,” but they are not speaking to the same person. — Again, if one bases the hope that his prayer will be acceptable to God on the redemption prepared by Jesus Christ, while the other assumes that he will be heard because of his clean record, having conscientiously done his duty to God and his country on his honor, though they jointly say “Our Father,” their prayers will be miles apart.

Since God is very jealous of His name and will not tolerate it that His name be taken in vain, a prayer which gives His name to a false god, or which is based on false premises, that are an abomination to Him, not only becomes worthless but invokes a curse on the head of him who thus takes the name of God in vain. His prayer stands condemned by God as blasphemy. And any one, although himself a true Christian, who joins in a blasphemous prayer makes himself guilty of the same offense. And it makes very little difference whether this is done regularly in prayer fellowship or in an occasional joint prayer.

From what has been said it is evident that joint prayer presupposes a common faith, believing in the same God and approaching Him on the same premises. This might be carried out further in relation to the Word which God has given us, whether we accept it as divine in every respect, or assume that it is intermingled with human elements, human inaccuracies and errors, etc.; but that will not be necessary to illustrate our point that joint prayer is proper only on the basis of a common faith.

Prayer is an expression of faith. Prayer fellowship presupposes a common faith; in other words, it presupposes church fellowship, established by a common confession of a common faith. Where the practice of the latter (church fellowship) is impossible for lack of a common faith, there also joint prayer will be impossible because there is no common approach to God; or if indulged in spite of the continuing disunity, it becomes sham, simulating a harmony which does not exist.

Prayer fellowship, then, cannot be studied profitably without a brief study of the Scripture doctrine of the Church. A thorough investigation of all phases of church life is not possible at the present time, nor is it necessary for the problem in hand. But three points should receive some attention, viz., the glory of the Church, the unity of the Church, and several things that might disturb this unity, together with their remedies.

I. The Glory of the Church

Glorious things of thee are spoken,
Zion, city of our God.

The most glorious of all, basic of all other glories, is the fact that the Church in all her members has complete forgiveness of her sins. Not a trace of her guilt may be found anywhere.

The Church is, indeed, composed of members every one of whom was originally a lost and condemned sinner. There is no difference among the members in this respect. Not one by nature had an advantage over any other. Not one, by nature, was able to achieve a *meritum condigni*, not even a *meritum congrui*, because the will of every member was fettered by sin, and the *opinio legis* vitiated every movement of his heart and mind. No member of the Church can say, nor will say, that when grace was offered to him, the sinner, that he met the grace of God and cooperated with it in his own conversion, not even that he suppressed his natural resistance, offered a less stubborn opposition, or threw himself into a neutral position, a passive attitude, in order to give the Holy Spirit a free hand to operate on him. There is no difference: all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. All were in *eadem culpa*, in *gleicher Schuld* (F. C., S. D., XI, 57; Trgl., p. 1080).

These originally sin- and guilt-laden members of the Church have, upon becoming members of the Church, in the very act of being admitted into the Church, been washed of all their guilt so that not a trace remains. To each one was applied personally the justification from sin which Christ achieved through His vicarious suffering and death, and which God confirmed and proclaimed to the world through Christ's triumphant resurrection. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them. . . . For he hath made him who knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him," "who was delivered for our offenses and was raised again for our justification."

True, every member of the Church, though a perfect saint by virtue of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, remains a sinner in his own ways. Original sin, his Old Adam, still cleaves to him, and frequently, many times a day, he yields to his inborn evil lusts in thought, in word, in deed. Yet his sins, committed involuntarily out of weakness or ignorance, have *veniam coniunctam indivulso nexu*. He is a member of the Church "in which Christian Church He (the Holy Spirit) forgives daily and richly all sins to me and all believers."

St. Paul jubilantly describes this glory of the Church in his letter to the Ephesians: "Christ also loved the church and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word: that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish" (ch. 5, 25-27).

In connection with this glory of holiness, with which we find the Church endowed, we should study also the means through which the Holy Spirit achieves His goal: Word and the Sacraments. We can but mention them in passing. The Word is the "word of reconciliation," by which the reconciliation purchased and won for us by Christ is being administered. It announces to us Christ's reconciliation, conveys it to us, offers it, pleads with us to accept it, and thus creates in us the very faith by means of which we do accept, and thereby become subjectively justified. In Baptism the Holy Spirit washes away our guilt so that no spot remains. He puts on us the robe of Christ's righteousness

as a festal garment fit for a king's palace, yes, for God's own heavenly mansions. In the Supper, by the very body and blood of our Savior, given and shed for us, He hands us a pledge of our forgiveness and thereby nourishes and strengthens our faith.

Since it is only through these means that God will glorify us, how extremely important that we retain them in their purity! How greatly should we cherish them and diligently use them! How jealously be on our guard to keep them unabridged, unadulterated!

We have approached the glory of the Church only from the one angle that her guilt has been completely removed and a sparkling holiness established through the imputation of Christ's merits. This gem of the Church's glory has other facets, all connected with justification and, in fact, based on it.

A glory of the Church is her liberty. Paul sums it up briefly in 1 Tim. 1, 9: *δικαίῳ νόμῳ οὐ κέεται.* The Church consists entirely of righteous people. It is the "communion of *saints*." No unrighteous person belongs to it. Hence to the Church applies this axiom that the law is not made for a righteous man. We mark the wide sweep of this statement. It takes in every righteous man, great and small, weak and strong, the beginner in faith as well as the far advanced, the mature Christian, and those that have finished their course. Every one is included. And every form of law is excluded, not only every form of ceremonial law, but also every form of moral law.

This fact which Paul announced as basic in his instructions to Timothy, he himself constantly applied in all his Gospel work. When he encouraged the Romans to lead a life of sanctification, battling against the servitude of sin and consecrating themselves to the service of God, he emphasized: "Sin shall not have dominion over you, for ye are not under the law, but under grace" (ch. 6, 14). And the specious argument of our Old Adam: "Shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace?" he knocks down with a curt *μη γένοιτο*, perish the thought (v. 15).

He warns his readers to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and not to be entangled again with the yoke of bondage. He throws the whole weight of his apostleship into the scales when he tries to impress on us the fact that a

compromise in this matter is impossible, that we forfeit Christ, the entire Christ with all His benefits, at the first moment that we in the least become entangled with the Law. "Behold, I Paul — an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father who raised him from the dead — I Paul say unto you that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised that he is a debtor to the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whoever of you are justified by the law. Ye are fallen from grace" (Gal. 5, 2-4). — Let us cherish our Christian liberty. A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.

Paul waxes very vehement in denouncing those who would in any way abridge our liberty. "If ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances?" (Col. 2, 20). In Phil. 3, 2, he uses strong invectives against such legalists — he calls them "dogs," "evil workers," "conscion" — in order to safeguard our faith and to preserve our Christian rejoicing in the Lord. We all shudder at his *ἀνάθεμα* in Gal. 1, 8, 9, and at his curse: "I would they were even cut off which trouble you" (Gal. 5, 12).

A sure way to lose our liberty is not only the one sketched just now, namely by submitting to ordinances, but also by using our freedom as an occasion for the flesh, or, as St. Peter phrases it: "for a cloak of maliciousness" (1 Pet. 2, 16). Jesus says: "Whoever committeth sin is the servant (*δοῦλος*, slave) of sin" (Jh. 8, 34). And Paul reiterates it thus: "Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants (*δοῦλοι*) ye are to whom ye obey, whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?" (Rom. 6, 16).

We are not under the Law, we are free, can be said only of such people as have the Law written in their hearts.

The prophet Jeremiah spoke in glowing terms about this state of affairs when he foretold the new covenant which the Lord would establish with Israel. It would supersede, and be far superior to, the one which He made with the fathers by leading them out of Egypt, the house of bondage. They always broke the old covenant, and He had to use force on them just to keep them in line outwardly till the time of fulfillment. He kept them

“under tutors and governors,” they were “in bondage under the elements of the world.” He set the Law over them as a “school-master” (*παιδαγωγός*). They were “kept (*ἔφρουροῦντο*) under the law, shut up (*συγκλειόμενοι*) unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed” (Gal. 3, 23, 24).

The new covenant the prophet then described in these words: “This shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel. After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts” (ch. 31, 33). We know what is written in our hearts by nature. Jesus says briefly: “Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies” (Mt. 15, 19). Such are the things written in every man’s heart by nature. What a wonderful change, a new birth, a new creation, when the Lord does write His Law into a man’s heart! Ezekiel speaks of it in this way: “I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them a heart of flesh: that they may walk in my statutes, and keep mine ordinances and do them” (ch. 11, 19). The same thought is repeated in ch. 36, 26, 27, with this addition: “I will put my Spirit within you,” who shall achieve that glorious change.

Such covenant must indeed be cherished by us, lest, by default, our heart relapse into its former state. What a loss that would be! In the new covenant our heart is all willingness in the beauty of holiness. It loves God and our neighbor. It prizes the Word of God, every jot and tittle that He has spoken or written, more than thousands of pieces of gold and silver. The Word of God is sweeter to its taste than honey and the honeycomb, the heart trembling only for one thing: lest it offend God and violate His statutes and testimonies.

Jesus says of such as keep His words: “If a man love me he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him” (Jh. 14, 23). St. Paul calls us the temple of the living God, a dwelling place of the Holy Ghost (1 Cor. 3, 16), an habitation of God through the Spirit (Eph. 2, 21). God does not reluctantly, as it were, dwell with such people. He “taketh pleasure in them that fear

him, in those that hope in his mercy" (Ps. 147, 4). Yes, "the Lord taketh pleasure in his people: he will beautify the meek with salvation" (Ps. 149, 4). It is not with stolid resignation that He says: I "will be their God and they be my people" (Jer. 31, 33; 2 Cor. 6, 16). Read the original promise of God on this point, and you cannot but feel the joyous heart throb of God at the thought that He can act as some people's God and can call them His own: "I will set my tabernacle among you, and my soul shall not abhor you (Litotes!). And I will walk among you, and will be your God, and ye shall be my people. I am the Lord your God which brought you forth out of the land of Egypt, that ye should not be their bondsmen" (Lev. 26, 11-13). Again: "Ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine, and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and an holy nation" (Ex. 19, 5. 6). "The Lord's portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance. He found him in a desert land, in the waste howling wilderness: he led him about, he instructed him, he kept him as the apple of his eye. As an eagle stirreth up her nest, fluttereth over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings, taketh them, beareth them on her wings, so the Lord alone did lead him" (Dt. 32, 9-11). "Thus saith the Lord of hosts: . . . He that toucheth you toucheth the apple of his eye. . . . Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion: for, lo, I come and will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord" (Zech. 2, 8-10).

What a glorious thing that God rejoices to dwell amid His Church, purified and set free by the vicarious work of Christ, and that we rejoice to have God in our midst without fear or trepidation, as grown-up sons enjoy the company of their father!

Not the least among the glories of the Church is the fact that Christ assigned a tremendous task to her, equipped her with beautiful and efficient means to carry out the task to His satisfaction, and shows the confidence in her that she will perform it to the best of her ability, without detailed instructions to keep her in line, without driving commands, without threats of punishment, without the lure of rewards.

The task which Jesus assigned to His Church is as comprehensive as the one which the Father assigned to Him when He sent Him into the world. It is its continuation and completion,

which Jesus achieves through His Church. That is the extent; and that is the limit, no other task did He assign. After His resurrection He greeted His disciples: "Peace be unto you. As my Father hath sent me, even so (καθὼς . . . καγὼ) send I you" (Jh. 20, 21). What the task is He summed up in His parting words: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Mt. 28, 18-20). That is a "big order," including preaching, teaching, exhorting, comforting, admonishing, warning, rebuking, strengthening, encouraging, guiding, feeding, and the like. But beyond these spiritual activities Jesus did not assign any task to His Church. He rather sharply rebuked His disciples when they asked about such other matters: "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" (Acts 1, 6). Οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστίν He said emphatically. Raising the economic, or hygienic, or even moral standard of community life is something which the Father has reserved for His own government of the world. The Church is to operate on a different level and with a different power, with the power of the Holy Ghost, who will equip her members to be "witnesses" unto Jesus. He will guide them into all truth. He will bring to their remembrance all that Jesus taught them.

That is certainly a great glory that Jesus assigned this task to us and equipped us with the gift of the Holy Ghost to carry it out. It is a great glory that He has excused us as Church from the sordid task of keeping order in the affairs of this world. The glory is so wonderful in its nature that the apostles rejoiced even in their tribulations because "they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name" (Acts 5, 41); that they taught us to look upon such afflictions as a gift: "Unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake" (Phil. 1, 29) — a gift which we receive, and bear triumphantly, in the interest of the Church as a quasi continuation of the sufferings of Christ (see Col. 1, 24), as a definite mark of our fellowship with Him (Mt. 10, 38; 16, 24).

We note in particular that the Lord in assigning this great

task to His Church did so without adding any qualifications or legal restrictions. He named the task, and gave the Church free scope. This glory of the Church would not be what it is, wonderful though it would remain, if our Lord in assigning the task had seen fit to prescribe also some definite way or manner in which it must be carried out. He told us to preach, teach, testify, confess, show forth His praises, and the like, but as to the manner, He assures us that we are not under the Law but under grace, that we are not children to be governed and tutored by rules and regulations, but are as sons of God come to age. As to Saul of old, so to us God says: "Do as occasion serve thee, for God is with thee" (1 Sam. 10, 7).

Moreover, Christ promised not only in a general way to be with His Church (Mt. 28, 20; 18, 20), to send another Comforter to guide us into all truth: He also provides us with men whom He endows and prepares for every exigency. They are His gifts to the Church. When He for reasons of His own withholds these gifts, all the offices which the Church may create within the congregations and within the synod, and all special committees which the Church may appoint, will be nothing but idling mechanisms, if not even instruments that work harm to God's kingdom. How richly Christ endowed His Church in the beginning we see from a record as it is contained in Acts. St. Paul enumerates such gifts on three different occasions, Eph. 4, 7-13; 1 Cor. 12; Rom. 12. It is the glory of the Church that Christ at all times provides her with suitable gifts. It is up to the Church to receive them gratefully and to employ them. Bengel cleverly remarks: *Iohanne utendum, non fruendum* (cf. Jh. 5, 35).

As a special form of the glory that Christ assigned to us the task of administering the reconciliation which He procured for us by His vicarious death, as a facet of special lustre, we mention this that Christ has committed to us the care for His weak brethren.

Christ Himself came, not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give His life as a ransom for many. All men were not only enfeebled by the fall of Adam, they were dead in trespasses and in sins. Christ came to abolish death and to bring life and immortality to light. He was particularly interested in the weak.

He did not come to call righteous men to repentance, but sinners. The strong and healthy have no need of a physician, but they that are sick. The smoking flax and the bruised reed require the most tender attention. To the consternation of the Pharisees Jesus associated with publicans and sinners, absolved harlots and adulteresses. He never condoned their sins, but He did cheer them by announcing to them unconditional pardon, and thus He helped them to escape the stranglehold of sin. — He carefully nursed the weak.

What a glory for the Church that Jesus entrusts to her the care of the weak! What a price He paid for them! He purchased them with His own blood. How carefully they must be handled lest they suffer harm! We ourselves, every member of the Church, have barely escaped from spiritual death. We are burdened with innumerable infirmities. Being patients ourselves, at best convalescents, we are so little experienced in the proper care of the weak, so liable to make mistakes. And yet, the Lord entrusts to us the care of His weak brethren. He is confident that we will do the right thing: on the one hand, like Himself, never in the least condoning sin, nor in word nor in deed; and on the other hand, ready to encourage, to cheer, to strengthen the weak, that they may not be overpowered by their weakness, but overcome it and increase in spiritual health and vigor.

If it is an inconceivably great glory that Christ committed to us the administration of the Gospel in general, it is the height of glory that He entrusted to us the care of His weak brethren.

The world will not give us credit for it. As they condemned Jesus when they saw Him tenderly nursing the weak, they will also ridicule us when they observe weak members in our midst. They would be ready to condone, they might even hail us as very liberal and broadminded, if we were to fellowship with errorists; just as they now condemn us as narrowminded, bigoted, fanatic, legalistic, when in obedience to God's Word we avoid them who in any way cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which God Himself has revealed to us. The world does not change in this respect. They heaped contempt on the early Church because of the weaknesses they observed in many of her members; and they do so today. But what is considered

a shame before the world is one of the greatest glories of the Church: Christ committed to us the care of weak brethren.

The picture that we have sketched of the beauty of the Church so far is only a very partial one. Traits that should be added in order to complete it a little more are, *e. g.*, the promise of victory against the powers of darkness: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it"; the fact which far transcends the powers of human imagination, that the Church is "the pillar and ground of the truth," of God's eternal truth and grace; the fact that the Church is the household of God, in which such as by nature were foreigners and enemies have been admitted into and united with the blessed family of God's children; and other features. But enough has been said to warm our hearts, to fill them with hope and joy, and to stir them to humble gratitude.

Since Christ has so glorified the Church it behooves us to avoid carefully everything that might mar this beauty; it behooves us, rather, to rejoice in this beauty, to praise Jesus for it by diligently using it for our own edification first.

"This is the meaning and substance of this addition (*sc. communio sanctorum*): I believe that there is upon earth a little holy group and congregation of pure saints, under one head, even Christ, called together by the Holy Ghost in one faith, one mind, and understanding, with manifold gifts, yet agreeing in love, without sects or schisms. I am also a part and member of the same, a sharer and joint owner of all the goods it possesses, brought to it and incorporated into it by the Holy Ghost by having heard and continuing to hear the Word of God, which is the beginning of entering it. For formerly, before we had attained to this, we were altogether of the devil, knowing nothing of God and of Christ. Thus, until the last day, the Holy Ghost abides with the holy congregation (*communio*) or Christendom, by means of which He fetches us to Christ and which He employs to teach and preach to us the Word, whereby He works and promotes sanctification, causing the communion daily to grow and become strong in the faith and its fruits which He produces" (Large Cat., Trgl., p. 691, 51).

What does the practice of prayer fellowship, or an occasional joint prayer, do to the glory of the Church, in which Luther

rejoices? That depends on the circumstances. A joint prayer may be a jewel of special luster in the Church's diadem — or it may be a disgusting, nauseating pollution.

(To be continued)

LUTHER PRAISED BY CATHOLICS

(From April issue)

Christoph von Utenheim, Bishop of Basel, hoped Luther might reform the church. So did his friend Jacob Wimpfeling of Strassburg. Luther's writings went to Italy in 1519, and soon some of them and Melanchthon's *Loci* were translated. Altieri was the leader of the Lutherans at Venice and the neighborhood. Others were found at Ferrara, Modena, Naples, and Lucca. There were Peter Martyr Vermigli, Bernard Ochino, Colius Curio, the Marquis Galeazzo Caraccioli, Pietro Paolo Vergerio; Aonio Paleario and Carnesecchi fell victims to the Inquisition.

Juan Valdes, Contarini, Sadoletto, Morone, Pole, Seripando were influenced by Luther's justification by faith.

The same was done by Andrew Cratander and others; Adam Petri even specialized in "Luther."

On the 18th the Basel professor and preacher Wolfgang Fabricius Capito wrote: "Switzerland and the Rhine country so far as the ocean are solid for Luther. . . . We have printed your collected works and sent them to Italy, France, Spain, and England, in this consulting the public welfare, which, we think, is advanced by having the truth spread as widely as possible."

During Lent, 1519, Luther preached on *The Suffering Savior*, printed at Wittenberg, Erfurt, Leipzig, Nürnberg, München, Basel, Zurich — 24 separate editions have come down to us.

In April came *The Lord's Prayer*, printed many times in many languages. John Schneider, Agricola, of Eisleben, printed it without the knowledge of the author, whom he praised as an "incomparable man." "Through Luther's writings and the Holy Ghost I became born again and a believing Christian." After Luther's death he paid a very fine tribute to that "man of God."

Beatus Rhenanus urged Zwingli to sell it from house to house. It was hailed everywhere, even at Venice. Only Duke George did not like it, not at all. Why not? At a dinner he told the heretic he had destroyed the devotions of the people — no one was any longer praying the Rosary!

Clayton writes: "The popularity of the treatise is certain and translations were made into Italian and into Bohemian. Luther's talent for forceful, homely German that all could read."

Friedrich Mecom, Myconius, with all his good works of monkery found no peace for his soul, he sank into despair, but then he found peace in Luther's works and became one of the first firm followers of "this God-sent man and last Elijah, the beginner, when no one as yet had dared dream of this matter." He addressed him as "God's most famous and faithful prophet of Germany, my father in Christ."

Erasmus on April 14, 1519, to Dean Colet of St. Paul's: "Every one who knows the man — Luther — approves his life, since he is as far as possible from suspicion of avarice or ambition, and blameless morals find favor even among heathen."

On May 18 to Cardinal Wolsey: "These people see only too plainly, that their own authority will fall to the ground, if we have the Sacred Books accessible in an amended form, and seek their meaning at the fountain-head. . . . Luther is no more known to me than to any stranger he might meet; and as for the man's books, I have not had time to turn over more than one or two pages. . . . The man's life is by a wide and general consent approved; and it is no small presumption in his favor, that his moral character is such, that even his foes can find no fault with it. . . . I do not claim so much authority, as to pass judgment upon the writings of so important a person. . . . You will find Erasmus devoted to the dignity of the Roman See, especially under the Tenth Leo." — *Nichols, Epistles of Erasmus*, Vol. III, pp. 380, 381.

To Luther on May 30, 1519: "Dearest Brother in Christ: Your letter, showing the keenness of your mind and breathing a Christian spirit, pleased me much. I cannot tell you what commotion your books are making here — Louvain.

"In England there are men who think well of your writing,

and they are the very greatest. (On one of Luther's books is the coat of arms of the Duke of Suffolk, brother-in-law of King Henry VIII.) I have dipped into your commentaries on the Psalms, which pleased me very much, and I hope they will do much good. . . . Keep on doing what you have been doing. . . . There is a man here, a Christian, who loves you extraordinarily; as he says, he was once your pupil. He is almost the only one who preaches Christ; the others preach either fables or only for their pockets. The Lord Jesus grant you from day to day more and more of His Spirit to the glory of His name and to the common good."

The same day to Lang at Erfurt, "All good men love Luther's boldness."

In the historic Leipzig Debate of 1519 Luther faced Eck on July 4 and soon "with his eye boldly fixed on his adversary, raising his voice, exclaimed, 'That among the propositions condemned by the Council of Constance there were some perfectly in accordance with the Gospel.'" Death-like silence.

"The plague take it!" rang out the favorite curse of the angry bearded Duke George with hand uplifted in a threatening manner. Eck retorted, "If you hold that a General Council can err, then you are to me a heathen man and a publican."

By that statement the Wittenberger really quit being a Catholic and became a Lutheran.

That battle of Leipzig was more important than that of Gustav Adolf, and that declaration of independence made possible that of Thomas Jefferson on July 4, 1776.

In winding up the debate on the 14, John Lange, the Rector of the University, calls Luther a man of the greatest integrity — "Not less in life than doctrine you act the part of Augustine."

"Gentlemen, I am unable by any oratorical power of mine to do justice to the genius and virtues of men so eminent as these rival champions. Let me follow the example of the painter Timanthes. Having to paint the cruel sacrifice of Iphigenia, he delineated Calchas, the sad prophet of the Trojan War, Ulysses dissolved in tears, Menelaus oppressed with sorrow. But when he came to Agamemnon, he felt that the powers of his brush were exhausted, and covered the face with a veil."

Classically and diplomatically the orator left it to his audience to decide whether the veiled Agamemnon stood for Eck or for Luther. Duke George thought he stood for Eck, and sent him a stag, the usual sign of victory; Carlstadt received a hind for coming out second best; Luther got nothing, not having been in it officially. Slick as an eel, that George.

Peter Schade of Mosel, Mosellanus, wrote thinking men gave the palm of victory to Luther. For his pupil Julius von Pflug and for Willibald Pirckheimer he paints this pen picture, the first we have: "Martin is of medium stature, spare body, so run down with cares and studies you can, when near, count almost all his bones. He is in his best years. He has a voice that is clear and carries well. His learning and Bible knowledge are wonderful, so that he has almost everything in hand. Of Greek and Hebrew he has learned enough to form an independent judgment. He is never at a loss for matter; for an extraordinary wealth of ideas and words are at his command. In his life and manners he is courteous and friendly, no frown and pride about him, and can adapt himself to all occasions. In company he is pleasant, lively, always sure of himself, and of a cheering face, no matter what evil his enemies may be plotting, so that one must needs believe he does not undertake such important matters without the help of God."

"Eck is a tall fellow, solid and stocky. His full, thoroughly German voice, sounding out of an enormous chest, would do not only for a tragedian but also for a public crier; but rather husky than clear. The sonorous Latin, so highly praised by Fabius and Cicero, certainly does not show to full advantage in his manner of speech. Mouth and eyes, in fact his whole physiognomy, is such that you would believe a butcher or rough Landsknecht stands before you rather than a theologian. As to his mind, he has a phenomenal memory. Had he an equally keen understanding, he were the picture of a perfect man. But he lacks quickness of perception and keenness of judgment, qualities without which all other mental gifts are of no use. . . . His gestures are almost theatrical, his bearing domineering, in short, he by no means makes the impression of a theologian, he is rather nothing more than an uncommonly insolent, yes, impudent sophist."

To his pupil Julius Pflug: "Eck carries a thick body on two strongly developed haunches, with the air of a comedian or public crier. With his large eyes, thick lips, and fiery face, one would take him rather for a butcher or Carian soldier, than for a theologian; give him as much learning as he has memory, and you will make an accomplished man of him. He is defective in penetration and judgment. In disputing you see him pile up arguments and quotations without choice or method. His aim is to mislead those who hear him; added to which is an incredible self-sufficiency, which he has the art of concealing with infinite success. He employs cunning. If he perceives that his adversary has found him out, he knows by a rapid turn to shift his ground and occupy that of his rival; who appears then to defend the opinion which his opponent first maintained, he is a hornet who steals the honey of others.

"Eck triumphs in the opinion of all who, like asses playing the harp, do not understand the subject at all. . . . The victory of Luther is less acclaimed, because learned and judicious men are fewer and less confident in proclaiming their own opinions."

He speaks of Eck as "walking on air and like Socrates despising even God from his basket . . . a terrible talker, but a weak speaker . . . like a horse let loose in a meadow . . . in the thinking-shop." (Aristophanes in his "Clouds" has Socrates drawn up into the air in a basket and calls Socrates' school a thinking-shop.)

The account of Mosellanus increased the Lutheran recruits among the Intelligentsia. Many nobles and knights rallied to his side; Franz von Sickingen and Sylvester von Schaumburg offered him a safe retreat in their castles. An ever growing number of students flocked to Wittenberg, even from Duke George's duchy. George Rhau of St. Thomas Church, John Poliander, who became "the Evangelist of Prussia," and Caspar Borner of the Leipzig University, were won for the truth and followed Luther to Wittenberg.

Congratulations came from Italy, Switzerland, France, the Netherlands.

Wenzel Rozd'alowsky wrote Luther from Prague on July 17, 1519: "A certain organist named James, who loves you much,

came upon us and told us all that is now being done between you and Eck and your other enemies. I cannot tell you, Father, how pleased, happy and delighted we were when he told us of the glorious victory you had won over your adversaries and especially over Eck's scholastic and Aristotelian rather than Christian theology."

Henry Stromer of Auerbach on July 19, 1519, wrote Spalatin: "Martin Luther, a man famous for eloquence, divinity and holiness of life disputed with Eck. . . . It is extraordinary how much holy theological learning was modestly distilled by Martin. He seems to me a man worthy of immortality. He uttered nothing but what was sound and wholesome, omitting all heathen learning, and content only with the majestic gospel and writings of the apostles. . . . He was like a harmless sheep among wolves, and the more hostile they were to him the greater and more holy was his learning."

Melanchthon wrote Oecolompad on July 21, 1519: "In Luther, now long familiarly known to me, I admire a lively talent, learning and eloquence, and cannot help loving his sincere and entirely Christian mind." First at Leipzig the difference between the true Christian theology and the scholasticism of the Aristotelian doctors had become quite clear to him.

Martin Bucer wrote Beatus Rhenanus on July 30, 1519: "Behold, dear Beatus, how vigilant are these wicked men, and how they conspire to murder, not Luther or others, but Truth itself. Not only Louvain and Cologne, but Oxford and Cambridge have declared war on Luther. . . . I have learned from a trustworthy friend, in whom Cajetan confided, that there was almost no page in a book of Luther's on which they had not written 'heresy, heresy,' several times. . . . But he said: 'We must not strike out too much. There is a very slight difference between some things which you have called heresies and the orthodox view. They are errors, not heresies.'"

Nicholas von Amsdorf to Spalatin on August 1, 1519: "As often as I think of the debate, I am moved and kindled, not, as God knows, for the love I bear Dr. Luther, but for that I bear the truth. . . . Even before this I knew that what Eck and his supporters brought forth was falsehood. . . . He can utter the words

he has learned with great pomp and proper gesture. He does not seek the truth, but only to show off his memory and to defend the teachers of his school. . . . I do not consider Eck the equal to Luther either in doctrine or art, either in delivery or in memory; I would as soon compare stones or mere filth to the purest gold."

Again: "If all commentaries, ancient and modern, are collected into one mass, and that which is best be selected from them, it could not be compared with the writings of this man. I am not ignorant how boastful this must seem, and to how many such a tribute must be offensive. But however others judge this assertion, I so affirm that, since the Apostles, no one has ever seen or ever will be furnished with such wisdom, faith and constancy as we have witnessed in Dr. Luther; nor have I any doubt that godly posterity will have the same judgment."

Boniface Amerbach wrote Ulrich Zasius at Freiburg on October 3, 1519: "The speeches of the Leipzig debate are being printed at Leipzig so that Eck, who as an unconquered Thraso, boasts of I know not what triumphs, may no longer be able to claim the victory as he does. Indeed, he had the egregious folly to tell Capito he found Martin's lungs full of heresy."

Willibald Pirkheimer, the Nuernberg humanist patrician, in "The Dressed Eck" gave a thorough dressing down to the prize fighting debater, and he became a joke.

Luther to Staupitz on October 3, 1519: "Letters have come from France reporting that Erasmus said: 'I fear Luther will perish for his righteousness,' and of Eck that his name lacks one letter and that he should be called 'Jeck', which is the Dutch for fool. Thus Christ beats down vain glory, so that him whom Leipzig adores as Eck, all learned men (they say) simply detest as 'Jeck'." Zwingli and Glarean made the same pun; Shakespeare used "geck." Crotus Rubeanus, who published the first series of the "Letters of Obscure Men" in 1515, wrote Luther from Bologna on October 16, 1519: "Martin, I am moved by your controversy with the Dominicans, who, with many others, conspire against your life. And had you not been sent by Heaven to this corrupt age, and had not a celestial hand guarded you as a teacher of Christian doctrine, we should long ago have delivered your funeral oration, so great is the fury of those who prefer their doctrine to that of

Christ; so great is Roman avarice that it would find a thousand ways of poison and treason, if there were any gain therein. . . . At Rome those who have your books are esteemed heretics. . . . When your cause was known the most prudent theologians discussed it with their lips. . . . For my part I believe that Christianity does not need fraud. Now the head of that faith allows divine honors to be paid to him. Phil. 2, 6. Princes and bishops — pour out a mighty quantity of gold for all their pallia, indulgences, bulls, trifles and nonsense, to enable the holy father to support their harlots and male prostitutes. . . . Whenever you, Martin, are mentioned, I am wont to call you the Father of the Fatherland, worthy of a golden statue and of annual feasts, for having first dared to deliver the people of the Lord from noxious opinions and to assert true piety. Go on as you have begun, leave an example to posterity; for what you do is not without the inspiration of the gods. . . . Germany will turn her face towards you, and will hear with admiration the Word of God from you. . . . The epistles of Lang and Melancthon inform us that the debate resulted favorably to us.”

John Hess of Breslau on November 19, 1519, wrote John Lang: “I showed the account of the Leipzig debate to the lovers of Martin, of which there are a great number in Italy, and they read it with pleasure, their joy being proportionately greater inasmuch as the Roman indulgence sellers, those evil speakers and spoilers, as the poor Greeks of our age call them, had previously triumphed, having heard from Eck’s letters that he had won.”

Isidore de’ Isolani of Cremona on November 22, 1519, lettered Luther: “Amiable brother . . . a man of such excellent parts as you, one who has penetrated the deep mysteries of divine writings . . . endowed with noble mind . . . man of candid mind and clear eloquence. . . . Alas! alas! why, more savage than any wild beast, do you turn your hand and sword against your own bowels? . . . Your foolish heart is weeping and mourning and quenched in hell.”

Erasmus to Bishop John Fisher of Rochester on October 17, 1519: “The Elector of Saxony has written to me twice. He tells me that in supporting Luther, he is supporting rather a principle than a person. He will not permit innocent men to be oppressed

in his dominions by malicious persons who rather seek themselves than Christ."

On November 1 to Albrecht of Mainz: "I think it is their fault if Luther has written too intemperately." This is worth remembering.

Adrian of Utrecht, tutor to Kaiser Karl, future Pope Adrian VI, on December 4, 1519, from Pamplona, Spain, lettered the Dean and Faculty of Theology at Louvain about Luther's teachings: "They are such crude and palpable heresies on their face that not even a pupil in theology of the first grade ought to have been caught by them. . . . I am greatly surprised that one who errs so manifestly and obstinately and who scatters his opinions broadcast, is allowed to err with impunity and with impunity to draw others into his pernicious errors."

Ulrich Zasius, the famous Swiss lawyer, on December 13, 1519, wrote Conrad Muth, Mutianus Rufus, canon of Gotha: "All those instructed in the pure doctrine follow Luther without reserve. But the monks and scholastic theologians, except a few good men, condemn him. Two of the best approved and most learned theologians of our university (Freiburg), John of Breisgau and George Waegolin (Achaeus) receive, bless and favor Luther and compare him to the ancient and true theologians. The whole of Switzerland, Constance, Augsburg, and a good part of Italy adhere to Luther. I consider Luther the best of men, by whose doctrine I have learned to follow Christ more truly . . . and would consider it a sin to wound him — an angel incarnate, the Phoenix among Christian theologians, the flower of the Christian world, the instrument of God." He still held to the decretals and the primacy of the pope.

Lazarus Spengler, the famous Secretary of Nuernberg, in 1519 wrote: "A Defense of a Lover of Christian Truth in which he Testifies to the Blessed Influence on his Life of Luther's Teaching." He says: "I have also often heard from many excellent and learned persons, lay and clerical, that they thanked God for having lived to hear Doctor Luther and his teaching. In Doctor Luther God has raised up a Daniel from among the people to open our blind eyes, to chase away by means of the Holy Scriptures the scruples and errors of troubled consciences, and to show

us the right, straight way to Christ, the only Rock of our salvation." See 369 in our Hymnal.

John Brenz wrote: "Never can I thank you enough. Keep on, dear Father, to comfort the stricken and to raise up the sorrowful."

John Eck in July, 1519, wrote friends at Ingolstadt about the debate at Leipzig and it seems made remarks about ignorant canons holding "Lutheran" opinions, and was thus the first to use the terrible term "Lutheran."

In December came Adelman's and Oecolompad's "Response of the Ignorant Lutheran Canons to J. Ecc." Eck said, this "Response" hurt him more than the many heavy guns of others.

Erasmus to Martin Lipsius of Brussels late in 1519: "They are starting a foolish and pernicious tragedy against Luther."

On March 14, 1520, Hermann Hump, who lived with Erasmus, wrote Luther that Erasmus almost adored him, though he kept his opinion for his table companions.

John Reuchlin to Michael Hummelberg at Ratisbon on January 3, 1520: "Perhaps Melanchthon is sorry for so learned and so upright a theologian and takes it ill that Luther has suffered so much reproach for the love of the orthodox Church."

The French Catholic Audin writes of Eck: "Pride was his besetting sin," and proves it. "An individual so vain must be fond of disputation, and he was passionately so. He was a merciless combatant, who spared his adversary neither sarcasm nor insult; who fought with him till the blood sprang, and when the strife was concluded trumpeted his own praises, to make his unlucky rival die of shame or ridicule. He had carried through a part of Europe his insatiable desire for theological controversy; every place was alike suited for his disputatious habits, the pulpit as well as the table. In the pulpit as at the table, he had quite an Italian style of declamation; incessantly in motion, he argued with his shoulder, head, hands, and feet; rich in style and knowledge, gifted with stentorian lungs, and a memory which Picus of Mirandola might have envied." Luther was not such a prize fighter. Audin admits: "We see in every page of his correspondence, especially with his friends, how that discussion tormented

him, and his endeavors to avoid it. 'In truth,' he says to Spalatinus, 'I would I were elsewhere.' Audin reports: "The disputation only served to excite new passions against Rome."

Anton Michl, professor of church history, holds Luther gained the victory over Eck at the Leipzig debate in 1519: "It seems John Eck must have felt Luther's over weight."

Eck is "a hired curialist. Too bad a German theologian let himself be used to degrade bishops into papal chaplains and putting up principles reeking of the Isidorian Decretals and against the fine resolutions of the German Church meetings of Constance and Basel."

Anglo-Catholic James B. Mozley of Oxford, not friendly to Luther: "The great disputation at Leipzig brought together all the young theologians of Germany, and Luther did immense execution. Pitted, greatly to his advantage, against the sharpest, noisiest, most vain, impudent, and unscrupulous disputant of the age, he won at one morning many of the subsequent lights of the Reformation."

The English Hilaire Belloc writes: "Luther came back, inspired by a feeling of popular triumph; wide-spread and very vocal support poured in upon him from all sides." P. 73, "How the Reformation Happened."

In August, 1519, Spalatin asked Luther to comfort the sick elector. "During a storm of business" Luther wrote "Tessaradecas," fourteen real comforters. Years after enemy Erasmus sent it to the Bishop of Basel, highly praising it as finding great favor even with enemies of the raving monk.

Luther to Spalatin on December 18, 1519: "My lectures on the psalter require a whole man; my sermons to the people on the gospel and Genesis need another whole man; a third is required by the little prayers and regulations of my order; a fourth might do this work you ask, not to mention my correspondence and my occupation with the affairs of others including my meetings with my friends, which steal so much of my time that I almost think it wasted. . . . I am one man."

Canon Conrad Muth, Mutianus Rufus of Gotha wrote Lang at Erfurt on May 15, 1520: "The eminent jurist Zasius extols our Luther to the skies."

The illustrious Willibald Pirckheimer, humanist patrician of Nuernberg: "All ages will remember that the Wittenbergers were the first to see the truth, the first to open their eyes after so many centuries, and to begin to separate the degenerate from the Christian philosophy. And who among those wise men is so eminent a preacher of Christ as Luther?"

Erasmus to Rector Paltz of Erfurt: "Hitherto he has certainly profited the world."

Glarean wrote Zwingli one dealer at the Frankfort Fair in 1520 sold 1,400 copies of Luther's works, which had never before happened with any other author. "Every one speaks well of Luther."

Luther's "Address to Caesar and the Christian Nobility of the German Nation" came in August, 1520. In 18 days 4,000 copies were sold and a number of reprints were in press. Bartholomew Forzio put it into Italian. In December Spalatin could show Luther over thirty letters of praise from princes.

The grim Duke George of Saxony at Leipzig in 1519 called Luther a pestilent fellow, and yet admired the Address to the Christian Nobility. Jerome Emser, the Duke's secretary and chaplain, and a personal enemy of Luther, yet hoped he might reform the church.

George wrote Rome: "It is not all untrue what is in the book, and it is not needless to the light of day. If no one dares talk of the evils in the Church and everyone must remain mum, then at last the stones will cry."

Praise from Duke George is praise indeed.

John Lang thought it "a classical, though a fierce and terrible booklet."

From Freiburg in Switzerland an organist wrote: "I've never read the like; all men wonder at it; some think the devil speaks through Luther, or the Holy Ghost."

French Catholic Audin reports: "That Tyrtæan hymn roused the whole nobility. Had the emperor called upon them, they would at that instant have crossed the Alps and marched against Rome to the war-song of Luther." — *Luther I, 272.*

WM. DALLMANN.

(Continued in next issue)

NEWS AND COMMENTS

An Overture and a Reply. — Meeting early in May for the purpose of assigning calls to its theological candidates, the College of Presidents of the Missouri Synod, consisting of the various District Presidents or their personal representatives, improved the opportunity to deliver itself of the following "Resolutions on Lutheran Unity."

"Recognizing that this critical period in the history of the world demands a realistic approach to the cultivation of unity in American Lutheranism, the College of Presidents of the Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod

1. expresses profound distress over Lutheran disunity and declares its desire and willingness to co-operate in efforts to achieve Lutheran unity in doctrine and its application to the life and work of the Church;
2. proposes that all Lutheran bodies in America join in free conferences of pastors and laymen, under the guidance of God's Holy Spirit, to establish existing agreement and to remove existing differences for the purpose of bringing about unity of Christian faith and fellowship;
3. hopes that a practical result of the discussions will be agreement in doctrine and the eventual formation of a federation of Lutheran bodies designed for co-operative Lutheran action on the basis of the Word of God;
4. Resolves collectively and individually, in the various Districts of the Missouri Synod, to promote Lutheran unity through brotherly discussion, with the hope that such discussion will lead to mutual recognition and co-operation;
5. requests the President of the Missouri Synod, in co-operation with the leaders of all other Lutheran bodies, to form a national inter-Lutheran committee for the purpose of arranging the proposed free conferences of Lutheran pastors and laymen."

A similar proposal for an All-Lutheran Free Conference had already been made late last year by the American Lutheran Conference in its Detroit Convention. It provided, however, that this conference be called by the National Lutheran Council, and held under its auspices. But when that group got into action, it was to advocate a plan for "closer organizational affiliation of the participating bodies in the National Lutheran Council." Federation was to be the first step, organic union the ultimate goal. These later developments indicate that a liberal coalition of the United Lutheran Church of America and of the Augustana Synod had taken control of a movement that in its original intent had been designed to include the more conservative groups as well.

It is therefore significant that the first reply to Missouri's overture should come from the President of the Augustana Synod, Dr. P. O. Bersell. Speaking before the annual convention of his synod, President Bersell reported, according to the *Minneapolis Star*, "that he had turned down the invitation because he feels that organic union or federation should first be achieved by the eight bodies making up the National Lutheran Council." Quoting his own letter, Dr. Bersell further said:

"There has been no desire on my part to exclude the Missouri Synod, but I have contended, and I think rightly so, that the eight bodies that have for so long a time worked together through the National Lutheran Council should be given opportunity to find their common denominator as far as union is concerned without any outside interference.

"After this has been found, then the approach can justifiably be made to other bodies that up to this time have definitely refused to work with us even through such an agency as the National Lutheran Council."

In other words, the door is eventually to be opened for Missouri also, but only after the dominant liberal element in the National Lutheran Council has consolidated its own position, strengthened its organization, and, having assimilated and digested its own discordant conservative groups, is ready for another portion. This is high strategy in the politics of the churches, power politics at that:

We are sorry that this overture has met with such a reception. For the slap is one at conservative Lutheranism. Let there be no mistake about that. But we are even more sorry that the overture was issued in the first place. For that provided the opportunity for this rebuff. Had the mutual consultation by the presidents of the constituent synods of the Synodical Conference, which is being asked for now, been sought before this overture was sent out, it might have been possible to point out and discuss certain principles which have an important bearing on the course to be followed. As it is, we can only express them *post festum*, and only as our own views on the matter.

Our Synod declared in 1939 that we are willing to meet for a discussion of doctrine and practice the representatives of any church body desiring such a conference, providing that it frankly admits that differences exist, and insists that they must be removed before we can enter into fellowship with each other. But now the Fellowship Committee of the American Lutheran Church is on record as standing for "an allowable and wholesome latitude of theological opinion on the basis of the teachings of the Word of God." The Executive Committee of the American Lutheran Conference has published an overture in which it proposed a plan for

union of the various Lutheran groups whereby each body pledges itself to its own doctrinal statements only, granting the same right to the other Lutheran bodies, and establishing fellowship on this basis. And concerning the present situation we have it upon excellent authority that whereas formerly a number of Presidents of the Lutheran Churches belonging to the National Lutheran Council were quite insistent upon at least agreement in all the important doctrines of Scripture, now, with one or two exceptions, the slogan seems to be that sufficient agreement exists. Thus even the first premises for a profitable "free conference" seem to be lacking.

We consider the emphasis on the participation of laymen ill advised, particularly because of the "free" nature of these proposed conferences. The men who attend on their own initiative become, in effect, representatives of their synod, although they may not be truly representative of their brethren at all. It is a matter of grave responsibility to represent a group, especially in such important issues as that of church union. A synod is entitled to a voice in the choice of the men who are to speak for it. The activities of self-appointed men do not unite the Church, but will divide it eventually. They offer occasion for propaganda and for the formation of pressure groups that do not serve the interests of the truth.

Another matter that was apparently not given sufficient thought is the fact that the internal unity of our Synodical Conference has been gravely disturbed. Shall these differences be aired in the presence of these men from other Lutheran bodies? Judging by Dr. Bersell's reply to Dr. Behnken, the leaders of the National Lutheran Council seem determined to define their stand in these questions of union "without any outside interference." That is plain common sense.

There is a Missouri with which we would be glad to stand shoulder to shoulder in an all-Lutheran forum, defending the cause of conservative Lutheranism against the inroads of unionistic thought. That is the Missouri of Walther, of Stoeckhardt, of Pieper. That is the Missouri which is trying manfully to counteract the modern trend in its own midst, and to correct the evils of unionism where they have arisen. That is the old Missouri which we have known in the past, and with which we willingly identify ourselves. But there is another Missouri which is very much in the public eye, which knows how to make itself heard, which has been obscuring the clear line of demarcation between the Synodical Conference and other Lutheran bodies, and which does not hesitate to cast aside as outworn the thought of "co-operation in externals only," and to express its satisfaction over those instances where co-operation with other religious groups has begun to involve the spiritual work of the Church (see *A Frank Statement* in this same issue). That is a different Missouri, one with which we could not make common cause, but which we would emphatically have to contradict.

Until it is clear which of these two will prevail; until it is known which

will be the true Missouri of tomorrow, we can see only further confusion arising out of these "free conferences." E. REIM.

A Frank Statement. — Writing in a recent issue of the *American Lutheran* (which in spite of its name is not published by the American Lutheran Church nor the American Lutheran Conference, but by members of the Missouri Synod), Dr. O. A. Geiseman defends his synod against charges made by an unnamed writer in an unnamed religious journal,* viz., that the Missouri Synod lives "in complete isolation from other religious groups," and that it finds itself "behind an ecclesiastical iron curtain." In reply to these charges, toward which Editor Geiseman is obviously quite sensitive, he marshals a long list of co-operative undertakings, some of which are quite inconsequential, others of considerable importance. It is on the latter that we have a few things to say.

It used to be the fashion, when such instances of joint activities among Lutherans were being discussed, to ward off the charge of unionism by stating that nothing more than a mere co-operation in externals was involved. At this point there usually was a deadlock, so that an important committee of the Synodical Conference could do no more at the last convention of that body than to "caution that such things only as actually are externals be regarded as externals." To which a floor committee made the following addition: "And that wherever there is co-operation in such externals, it be not permitted to grow into joint work in the spiritual sphere." The entire discussion implied agreement on the principle that joint work in the spiritual sphere by church bodies not in fellowship with each other constitutes unionism. Apparently the only question was whether the instances under discussion involved spiritual factors or not. We contended that they did.

It is therefore a bit of refreshing candor when Editor Geiseman answers his unnamed editorial opponent:

"Quite obviously the writer of the article was not too well informed, for the truth is that our church now is cooperating and for a long time past has cooperated with various religious agencies which in no sense of the term could be said to be identified with

* *The Christian Century*, October 27, 1948: "The negative pole of Lutheranism is the Synodical Conference. Its largest denomination is the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, which has 4,400 churches and 1,576,000 members. It refuses to cooperate even with other Lutherans in the National Lutheran Council, and generally follows a line toward other Protestants which reminds one of Russia in the United Nations. Like Russia, it has organized its satellite denominations, such as the Wisconsin Synod, into an alliance behind an effective ecclesiastical iron curtain of non-intercourse. None of the Synodical Conference churches are likely to unite with others. Their position, however, has a great influence on the National Lutheran Council denominations because in each group many church members lean toward Missouri." — We feel that this is too good to withhold from our readers. Ed.

the full doctrinal position of the Missouri Synod. What is more, *this cooperation has applied not only to so-called externals* such as feeding and clothing the needy, *but to the very heart and core of the church's task*, which is bearing witness to the saving grace of God in Christ." (The italics in this and the following are ours.)

Concerning the discussions held at Bad Boll there are some further illuminating remarks:

"Last summer officially appointed representatives of our church met for a number of weeks with representatives drawn from various Lutheran Churches in Germany. The meetings were held for the purpose of discussing important doctrinal truths. Each day was opened and closed with devotional services. The privilege of leadership in these services was shared equally between representatives of our church and of the German Churches. *When we meet with Christians from other church bodies not affiliated with our Synod to pray with them and to worship with them one can scarcely say that this is in the area of the 'externals'* or that we are hiding ourselves behind an iron curtain."

We appreciate the frankness of these statements. They admit what we have been claiming for some time. But now that the facts are established, will the old accepted principles be applied?

In a further paragraph the situation in the Synodical Conference is discussed.

"Our Synod is associated with several other Lutheran Synods in the so-called Synodical Conference. Some of the constituent Synods of this group have for many years condemned as incorrect some of our teachings and some of our practices. Despite this fact, we have continued in pulpit and altar fellowship with all constituent Synods. Although the many meetings which have been held to bring about a fuller measure of doctrinal unity have failed of their purpose, and even though as we are told some members of the Synodical Conference have refused to commune with members of our church because of existing differences, our Synod has expressed no desire to sever the bonds of fellowship. We have been ready to cooperate at least on the level of unity which does exist."

The Doctor is right when he speaks of grave issues that have arisen to trouble the Synodical Conference. But he causes dangerous confusion when he speaks as though there were no difference between patient and prolonged efforts to preserve an existing fellowship and an easy, tolerant readiness "to co-operate at least on the level of unity which does exist." It is a misleading *aequatio terminorum* when he speaks of this situation

as though it were identical with the others that he has described, where, in most cases, the necessary prerequisite of doctrinal unity has never been achieved.

No, we still hold that doctrinal unity is an indispensable requirement for the constituent synods of the Synodical Conference. We hold the settlement of the troublesome issues to be the most pressing business of the respective bodies. We are ready to make further efforts to this end. But the situation is certainly not improved by the cynical statement of Dr. Geiseman. If his views are to prevail, and if that be the interpretation which is to be placed upon the patience that must be exercised in the attempt to restore the old harmony of the Synodical Conference, then patience may cease to be a virtue. Then dissolution may be the only honorable alternative that remains. And the advocate of a wide co-operation and an easy tolerance will have helped to bring it about.

One frank statement deserves another.

E. REIM.

A Memorial. — In the January issue of our quarterly on page 76 we reprinted a declaration made by four Free churches in Germany, namely the Evangelical Lutheran Church in former Old Prussia (Breslau Synod), the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church in Saxony a. o. St., the Independent Evangelical Lutheran Church in Hesse and Lower Saxony, and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Baden. At the time when this declaration was written, October 31, 1948, the Evangelical-Lutheran chapel-congregations (*Kapellengemeinden*) in Hamburg addressed a memorial to the Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the State of Hamburg. These two chapel-congregations represent a conservative Lutheran group within the Hamburg Land Church, but feel themselves more closely allied to the churches in the Hermannsburg territory. Of the members of the Lutheran Free Churches they speak in their memorial as of "our nearest brethren." They realize that they in common with the Free Churches "are carrying on a strong defensive warfare against the floods of Reformed-rationalistic (and also increasingly Roman) influences," as one of the signatories of this memorial, the Reverend E. Bauer, pastor of *Kreuzkirche*, has assured us. Their memorial is, indeed, a forceful testimony against the unionistic setup and tendencies of the Evangelical Church in Germany (EKD). Therefore it does not surprise us to be informed that there was no noteworthy response to this memorial on the part of the Hamburg Land Church, which with many other Land Churches joined the EKD. It, however, does take us somewhat by surprise that the few "Lutheran" leaders of the EKD, to whom this memorial was also submitted, failed to give it any attention. We are happy to be in a position to publish this memorial with its clear-cut and forceful argumentation and to invite our readers to read and study it. In view of parallel unionistic

endeavors on the part of Lutheran churches in our country, it is time well spent to acquaint oneself thoroughly with the arguments used by these two pastors in warning their Land Church against joining the EKD. The memorial reads as follows:

“Memorial of the Ev. Luth. Chapel-Congregations, Cross Church and St. John’s Chapel, submitted to the Synod of the Ev. Luth. Church in the State of Hamburg.

“We are herewith memorializing Synod as to the possibility of our Land Church joining the EKD, supporting our statements with the following arguments:

1. The EKD calls itself a “federation” of confessional churches and also “Evangelical *Church*.” By doing so it creates a discord which converts the whole constitution of the EKD, the basic order (Grundordnung), into a weighty problem. This problem cannot be formulated as an equation: federation *and* church, but only as an alternative: federation *or* church. After all, one is not permitted to use the name “Church,” which is held sacred by us as an essential part of the Third Article, where it is used as the name of the creation of the Holy Ghost, for any kind of a man-made organization. Such a use of the word makes it difficult for the world without and for the congregation to gain an understanding of the uniqueness of the Church, and also can mislead them to think of the EKD as church rather than as a federation.
2. Indeed, we find this being attempted in the Basis, whereby the way is opened for many tensions, divisions, and overlappings. *The EKD is church*, its constitution is a vessel which only seems to be waiting to be filled with the content of all that belongs to the complete life of a church. The EKD has ecclesiastical offices and ordinances, as for instance a Synod, which are the property of a church alone. It has a confessional foundation, namely the three old Ecumenical Creeds, which a federation does not need. Thus a new type of an Evangelical church is in the making, one that does not, to be sure, lay claim to a Reformation confession. What ecclesiastical body has the call to bring about such a new creation? How can an Evangelical church whose confession is thus curtailed take over the duty of congregating, representing, and in every way spiritually guiding its constituent church-bodies founded on the Reformation? The EKD lays claim to this authority. As a kind of a super-church with its influence on the formation of the life of the churches it takes away, for instance, from the Lutheran Church its confidence and initiative which it has on the basis

of its confession, by training candidates for the ministry, by calling men into the church councils, by taking over the leadership of the large congregational organizations of young people and of adults, by its work in the mission, diaspora, etc. Yet no confessional church in the field of inner and outer activities can serve two masters. It can only feel itself responsible in every detail for its congregations on the strength of its own confession. Otherwise the life of the constituent church bodies becomes disintegrated, the sole efficacy of their confession is being counteracted and undermined.

3. Here the actual danger becomes apparent. *The EKD is a unionistic church.* The truth of the Gospel testified to in the Confession is not any longer the only binding force. Despite the consideration given to the individual confession a new and a common confession is to be written by "giving ear to what each one of the brethren has to say" (*Hören auf die Brüder*), i. e., by carrying on new deliberations concerning the questions which have not been answered since Luther's days and which even now separate the churches. This presupposes that one can gain a new understanding of the Lord's Supper, for instance, through such deliberations. That is to say that the fathers erred in such doctrines and that we must set them aright. It would imply a temporary suspension of the Confession by doubting what it teaches concerning the Word and the Sacrament. An hour of temptation has struck for us, tempting us not to retain any longer what we have, and then as a result to lose the crown. We still owe the congregation but that *one Gospel* which proclaims the Savior as the *one comfort for troubled consciences*. The point at issue is the appropriation of salvation by grace alone, the appropriation of salvation by faith alone. The point at issue is the bodily presence of the Lord in the Sacrament, which one can only reverently receive or to which one can only give a new rationalistic meaning. Lutheranism wants to worship and receive. Because the new confessional formation of the Basis has been introduced by an appeal to the Barmer Declaration of 1934, it will needs become a hindrance for the free expansion of the Lutheran Confession, since the unionistic line of development of the Barmer Confession has been derived from the historical experience gained in the church conflict. Behind it all there is a theology which does not permit one to speak of an historical existence of the Church, that philosophical and reformed line of thought, which without any regard for the Scriptures robs the congregation of the certitude that the Word and the Sacraments are its very own, that it can

not only "from time to time" but at all times be certain of the presence of the Lord (D. Merz, *Ev.-luth. K.-Zeitg.* 15 v. 30. 9. 48.).

- 4 We are also convinced of the final visible unity of the Church and of the fellowship of all believers as our goal. But the realization of this unity is the Lord's business at His Coming. There is no "prophetical office" of the Church (thus Bishop Dibelius in his Eisenach sermon), which today "may anticipate that which God wants to bestow on us." No desire for unity justifies us to sacrifice any part of the truth. Union for the sake of unity or for the sake of the mass-impact of the Church is a departure from the true commission of the Church. Observing the EKD in action, however, we detect *another gospel* in its proclamations (*Amtsblatt* v. 15. 7. 48), emphasized by still other utterances of leading men in the EKD and the *Ecumene*. They are offering a social and political gospel "for the disorganized world," in order to gain a world peace, a fair living condition for every human being, a national unity, and the like. These needs concern all of us, but they do not belong to the mandate of the Church. To claim that they do, results in giving the world a false gospel and a wrong picture of the Church. The soberness of the Lutheran faith warns us not to do it. The Augsburg Confession, Article 17, condemns in all earnestness this visionary enthusiasm which leads one into a deceitful messianism.
5. Lutheranism also has an ecumenical calling, namely to remain pure and thereby to be prepared for the time when the world, despairing of its own ability, will seek the Word and the Sacraments. Indeed, it holds the strong position of a conclusive nearness to the Gospel in its Pauline profundity. Lutheranism can only preserve its saving "dynamics" for itself, for the whole Church, and for the world, if it even now does not enter into the world-wide unionism, but assured of its ecumenical calling draws as much as possible from its own heritage. It is also a part of this calling that it does not close the door to Free Church Lutheranism. Membership in the EKD must, without doubt, have an excluding influence on these our nearest brethren. Refusing to join the EKD would also strengthen the knowledge of the need of confessional separateness which is awakening in the *Ecumene*, and on the other hand make it possible for many a Lutheran Christian to remain in the old home-church without any pangs of conscience.

"On the strength of these arguments we request the Synod to decline membership of the Hamburg Land Church in the EKD.

The pastors and the church councils
of the chapel-congregations:

Pastor Bauer/Helmut Schultz
Cross Church

Pastor Isenberg/Johannes Kortendieck
St. John's Chapel

* * * *

In order to give our readers an idea of the position in which these protesting congregations now find themselves after the Hamburg Land Church has ignored their memorial and has gained membership in the EKD, we add a chapter from a "Short Review Of The Struggle For The Lutheran Confession Within The German Lutheran Land Churches," which has been forwarded to us by one of our informants in Germany. It reads:

"In Hamburg the two seventy-year-old pastors of the chapel-congregations (Bauer and Isenberg) mainly fought against the adoption of the Basis on the part of the Hamburg Synod, in which they themselves were not represented. Their memorial was hardly recognized, since Landesbischof Schoeffel had to contend with all force against the opposite front, *i. e.*, against the determined opponents of the Lutheran Church among the pastors of the Hamburg Lutheran Church. These wanted to prevent Hamburg from joining the United Lutheran Church. In this they did not succeed. The chapel-pastors, however, were and are now in desperate straits: Very small congregations dispersed as a result of the stress of war (each congregation numbering about 300 souls), bombed church buildings, complete lack of means, which at every step make things quite impossible for them. Added to this, there is the heritage of their original stand as chapel-congregations, which despite all criticism of the Land Church also included from the very beginning a negative attitude toward an alliance with the Free Church. Consequently it now is difficult for them to take the step of separating themselves, even if in principle they should so desire."

Still we harbor the hope that these two pastors with their congregations will follow up their good confession, which they have laid down before many witnesses, by separating their connections with their Land Church and by joining the Lutheran Free Church, whose members will then indeed be their "nearest brethren."

P. PETERS.

A Declaration. — After Dr. Hermann Sasse, who needs no further introduction to our readers, had declared in an open letter addressed to Bishop Meiser in Munich on October 31, 1948, that he had left the Bavarian Land Church to join the Free Church because the former had become a member of the EKD, the Reverend Friedrich W. Hopf, pastor of the Bavarian Land Church congregation in Mühlhausen (Oberfranken), now

also has declared in communications addressed to Bishop Meiser that he rejects the Creedal Basis (Grundordnung) of the EKD and regards the decision of the Ansbach Landessynode in September of 1948, which voted the Bavarian Land Church into membership with the EKD, as contrary to the Lutheran Confession and also as violating the constitution of the Bavarian Land Church.

Here we have, to our knowledge, the first instance of a German Land Church pastor refusing to become party in joining the EKD and not being afraid to declare publicly that his church, by joining the EKD, has acted contrary to the Confession and its own constitution. We gladly grant his declaration, as far as it sets forth the confessional stand of this intrepid pastor, space in our quarterly.

On January 28, 1949, the Reverend Hopf declared in a writing addressed to Bishop Meiser: "Bound to the Word of God and the Scriptural Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, I reject the 'Basis of the Evangelical Church in Germany' which has been decided on in Eisenach on the 13th of July, 1948, because it is not in agreement with the clear injunctions of the Word of God and the Lutheran Confession based thereon.

"God's Word commands the separation from all who adhere to false doctrine (comp. Matt. 7, 15; Rom. 16, 17; Gal. 5, 9; 1 Tim. 6, 3-5; Tit. 3, 10; 2 John 10). In evident opposition to the divine injunction the Lutheran churches are being united and joined up by the Eisenach Basis into an 'Evangelical Church' with those who adhere to Reformed and United Confessions. This is being done despite the false church-destructive doctrines contained therein.

"The Lutheran Confession teaches unequivocally in Article VII of the *Confessio Augustana* on the basis of Ephesians 4 that there also belongs at all times to the true unity of the Christian Church the oneness in faith, and that one can only speak of a church-unity where there is agreement 'concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments.' In open opposition to this Scriptural doctrine all the Lutheran, Reformed, and United Confessions of the various member-churches within the Evangelical Church in Germany, whose main articles contradict one another, are to become effective. The 'federation' of these churches with their contradictory confessions shall be called 'Evangelical Church' and as such is to have one common leadership, one constitution, and one executive council.

"I am willing to prove that the Basis also contradicts the Lutheran Confession in many other places, for instance in the statements concerning 'Barmen' and the admission to the Lord's Supper."

In a second declaration dated May 5, 1949, the Reverend Hopf declares: "No one has been able to prove till now that the Basis of the EKD can be reconciled with the doctrinal statements of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession and the Formula of Concord. It has, however, always

been maintained that despite this Basis one is bound by the confession of the Land Church and that it is one's intention to hold fast to it. Yet it could not be denied that the opinion which was held by me and other Lutheran theologians actually agrees with the wording and meaning of the Lutheran Confessions. If this were not the case, Bishop Dr. Meiser could not have repeatedly and with so many words assured me that I also within the Land Church could and should continue to give expression to my opinion. Repeatedly I have been called upon to carry on my opposition in a theological way. In this I see a confirmation of the fact that my protest does not repudiate the Word of God and the Scriptural Confession of our Church. But if this is admitted, the right also must not and cannot be questioned which permits one to draw the churchly consequences from the theological confessional protest. He who (like I) is of the well-founded conviction that the acceptance of the Eisenach 'Basis' is an unscriptural church-union with those who adhere to false doctrine, can and dare not participate in this union. What Melancthon once declared in his treatise which is a part of our Confession must be repeated and applied by me today: 'To dissent from the agreement of so many nations and to be called schismatics is a grave matter. *But divine authority commands all not to be allies and defenders of impiety and unjust cruelty*' (Trigl. 516, 42). In this connection we are facing an either/or: Either the Lutheran Confession including the bounds which it draws between the churches over against those who 'teach otherwise than the Word of God teaches' stands, — then I can, may, and must also appeal to the doctrinal affirmations of the Formula of Concord as they are to be applied to the Reformed and United Churches; or the Lutheran Confession is not anymore in effect as to its verbal and literal meaning — then one has, indeed, actually separated himself from the doctrinal affirmations of the fathers, which they set up in view of the account to be given before the judgment seat of Christ. I cannot choose this latter alternative. I do not want to make any other confession than Luther, Paul Gerhardt, Wilhelm Loehe, and numberless others have made. But also in regard to a church union, including that of the Lord's Supper, I want to live and practice according to this Confession. And I want to officiate in a church, in which this practice is not just being tolerated as an exception to the general rule, but in which it is generally recognized and required. Therefore and only because of this reason I have become involved in this regrettable conflict with Bishop Meiser. No other reason forced me to declare that I am not any longer able to recognize the church-government bound to the EKD as one conforming to the Confession. With these my decisions I did not desire anything else than to do what my oath of office demands of me, binding me to God's Word and the Lutheran Confessions. Now we are placed before the question: Is the church-government in Munich able and willing to endure the distress of this dissension? Or have the church

authorities the power and the intent, because of this my confessional stand, to force me out of office? Can Bishop Meiser attempt it, and how will he and his territorial church-government bear the responsibility of prohibiting me to conduct my sacred ministerial office in the congregation which is entrusted to me after having been in office 16 years, 13 years in Mühlhausen, and after having reached the 39th year of my life?"

Since Rev. Hopf refused to retract his declaration, he was deposed on May 18 of this year. Officially his deposition took on the form of his being pensioned off. In reality, however, Rev. Hopf is not permitted to officiate in the congregation of Mühlhausen or in any other Land Church congregation. His pension will undoubtedly be withdrawn as soon as he serves members of his former congregation and seeks to organize a Free Church congregation in Mühlhausen. At present about 35 of his former members are requesting the service of their former pastor. Whether this small number will grow into a congregation that is willing to call and support its pastor, waits to be seen. At present the Reverend Hopf intends to remain at his post and to serve this small group.

May the Lord of the Church strengthen and support this servant of His in his stand for the truth of the Scriptures and our Lutheran Confessions and may his zeal provoke many to testify to the truth in like manner.

P. PETERS.

Oberursel. — A report on the winter-semester of the Lutheran Theological *Hochschule* at Oberursel in Germany has reached our desk. The semester began November 11th and closed on the 4th of March. The student-body numbered 29 students, many of whom had served in the German army during World War II, some of them also having spent a few years as prisoners-of-war before they again took up their studies. Consequently the average age of a student at Oberursel is higher than that at our seminaries. The four members of the faculty are the professors Kirsten, Kiunke, Laabs, and Oesch. The Rev. Wm. Oesch had to take a forced leave of absence for the greater part of the semester because of illness. The Rev. Herman Stallmann of Allendorf a. d. Lumda (Hessen) joined the teaching force of the *Hochschule* one day of each week. The subjects taught in the past semester were: Old Testament Theology and Isaiah (Lic. Laabs); Genesis (Rev. Stallmann). New Testament: The Pastoral Letters (Rev. Kirsten); Matthew (Lic. Laabs). Historical Theology: The Reformation, History of Doctrine, and Union Endeavors in the Church (Lic. Kiunke). Systematic Theology: Dogmatics (Part III) and Symbolics (Rev. Oesch); Ethics and Philosophy (Lic. Laabs). Practical Theology: Encyclopedia and Catechetics (Rev. Kirsten); Homiletics (Rev. Kirsten and Lic. Laabs). Two guest-speakers lectured in the course of the semester: Professor Holsten of the University of Mayence on *Missions from a Lutheran Standpoint* and Dr. Herm. Sasse on *Modern Catholicism*. The University of Mayence

also invited the Oberursel students to take part in a series of lectures on *Modern Intellectual Movements*.

Apart from their work in class-room and study the students twice a week also instructed 40 children of the neighborhood, many of whom belong to un-churched families. Added to these weekly instruction-hours the students took turns in conducting regular Sunday-services for the children. The parents of the children have also been visited by the students and invited to attend the services conducted by the members of the faculty in St. John's Chapel on the Seminary grounds. This building also houses the Seminary Library, which the Free Church succeeded in removing from Zehlendorf to Oberursel before Berlin had been cut off from the Western Zones.

From this report it is evident that both professors and students have put in much time and labor on their respective work. We share the hope of Lic. Kiunke, who had taken over the rectorate for the past semester, that this work bears its fruit in due season. He states hopefully and prayerfully in his report: "The best portion of the work of a theological school is as invisible as the seed which is entrusted to the native soil. It may not thrive before it does so in the ministerial work of the future pastors."

As to the future of this theological school Lic. Kiunke has this to say in part: We cannot any longer keep it a secret. Because of outward, economic reasons the existence of the school is being jeopardized. How can such a school, only a few years old, support itself alone! Only if we at least get the help and assistance from abroad and from our own congregations that we received in 1948, will we be able to hold our own. The report closes with the plea: Do not forget us in our needs which are verging on the very danger-zone.

P. PETERS.

The Aleppo Manuscript. — Most of our readers have undoubtedly read of the riot in Aleppo during which a mob destroyed a famous Hebrew manuscript of the Old Testament. This is the Aaron ben Mose ben Asher Bible manuscript, which was preserved in the *Sephardian* synagogue of Aleppo and which Paul Kahle dates to the year 929 A. D. Kahle wanted to use this Aleppo manuscript in editing the third edition (1937) of Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*. The Jews in Aleppo, however, did not, at the time, allow the sacred scroll to be submitted to photography. Therefore Kahle had to fall back on the Leningrad manuscript, called **L** in the *apparatus criticus* of the *Biblia Hebraica*. This codex represents a later copy of ben Asher's text made in Old Cairo in 1008-1010 by Samuel ben Jacob for the priest Merodak. Still Kahle, with the help of Michael ben Uzziel's list of discrepancies made for the purpose of ascertaining the differences between the ben Asher and the ben Naphthali text, had become convinced that the Leningrad codex is a genuine ben Asher text. Therefore the loss of the Aleppo manuscript is not irreparable.

P. PETERS.

REVIEWERS' DESK

The Lutheran Lord's Supper in the Episcopal Church from the Reformation to the Present. By William Dallmann, D. D. Stiff paper covers. 57 pages, 5×7 $\frac{3}{4}$. Price, 50 cents. — Printed in Northwestern Publishing House.

On 57 pages the author has assembled a vast amount of quotations from many sources not readily accessible to the majority of readers. Some of the quotations need explanatory remarks, else they too easily become misleading. Sorry to say, the author merely compiled the quotations.

On p. 2 we read: "Ambrose Blarer read Luther's writings in 1521 and became a Lutheran reformer. In a work on the Lord's Supper in January, 1535, he denied the unworthy receiving the Lord's body, and it was approved by Luther." — This is misleading. Blarer taught that by virtue of the words, *This is my body . . . my blood*, the body and blood of Christ are truly present and are given *substantialiter et essentialiter, non autem quantitative vel qualitative vel localiter*. In 1537 he did not subscribe the Smalcald Articles because of the statement concerning the *bösen Christen*. In 1538 he withdrew from Luther.

The remark on p. 3, that Bucer taught: "The unbelievers receive only bread and wine" and that Luther said, "About that we'll not quarrel" might leave the impression as though Luther considered the eating of the true body of Christ by unworthy guests as an open question. That was not so. Bucer had not only conceded that also unworthy guests receive the body and blood of Christ, but by "unbelievers" he meant people who were plainly outside the confessing church, such as Jews and Turks; he even mentioned mice and worms in the same breath. That changes the picture.

The testimonials on p. 37ff. must be studied with care. There are several that do not present the Lutheran doctrine. Some speak of the personal presence of Christ. This is not the same as the real presence of His body and blood. See, *e. g.*, p. 42, 1. 21; p. 46, 1. 1; p. 57, 1. 12. To say that the faithful receive the body and blood of Christ is not conclusive evidence that the writer confesses the Biblical doctrine of the Supper. See, *e. g.*, p. 38, 1. 9 and 1. 26; p. 46, 1. 16; p. 47, 1. 7 from below; p. 55, 1. 12.

If used with discretion the compilation may be put to good use. M.

Everyday (A book of Directions and Material for Personal Devotions), by Carolus P. Harry. Revised edition published by *Una Sancta*, 2106 E. Warne Avenue, St. Louis 7, Mo. Paper cover, 76 pages. No price listed.

This is one of the most pleasing prayer books that has ever come to the attention of this reviewer. The material is well chosen. The prayers are often given in a liturgical frame, and are well adapted to the different seasons of the Church Year. The "directions" are in the nature of simple, quiet, helpful suggestions, meant to aid rather than dominate a Christian in cultivating his personal prayer life. The manner in which the author follows and recommends the custom of making the sign of the Cross indicates that he is mindful of the fact that this custom is an adiaphoron, and not an essential part of prayer. One has the feeling that one could sit down with the author and discuss the pro and con of a revival of this old Lutheran custom (cf. Luther's Morning and Evening Prayers) without finding in him an advocate of this custom either as a cure-all for our spiritual ills or as a *sine qua non* of prayer.

A short section of the booklet deals with Holy Communion. Here we find some symptoms of the sacramentalism of the liturgical movement. No one will question the statement, "The Atonement is complete" (p. 61). But when this is read in its context it is difficult to escape the impression that it is the sacramental act of the Communion which makes it complete, which changes the picture considerably. On the same page one finds the following, "The unity of the Church is in the Holy Eucharist." We know that the Sacrament gives expression to this unity, but there is something exclusive in this statement that seems to attribute to the Communion something more than Scripture itself does. It should not be forgotten that in the classic passage on the unity of the Church, Eph. 4, 3-6, the Eucharist is not even mentioned.

These exceptions we feel constrained to note. But we hope nevertheless that this booklet will find wide distribution. E. REIM.

Lars Wilhelm Boe. A Biography by Erik Hetle. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis 15, Minnesota. Price, \$2.50.

The story of Lars Wilhelm Boe will always be of special interest to college presidents, professors, and students. They will enjoy reading what the author, Professor Hetle, until 1946 chairman of the department of physics at St. Olaf College and for many years closely associated with Lars W. Boe, has to tell his readers about the intense and many-sided activities of Dr. Boe as president of Waldorf College from 1903 to 1918 and of St. Olaf College from 1918 to 1942. But there are others besides college professors and students who come in for their share of interesting reading. For President Boe's interests were not only limited to those of a college president and educator, as much as these may ordinarily go to make up the measure of one man's life. He also was a preacher, whose "Sundays, particularly, would have been barren could he not have served the Church in some way." His chapel talks, many of which were broadcast by the St. Olaf radio station and some recordings taken, undoubtedly

did more than any other phase of his activity to determine the spirit and atmosphere pervading the life at St. Olaf. We are grateful to the author for having given us one of Dr. Boe's characteristic chapel talks (pp. 92-105).

Added to these activities as an educator and preacher are also those of a politician and church statesman. As the foremost consuming interest in his life Professor Hetle puts "Church and National Lutheranism," or to use the heading of one of his chapters: "National and World Lutheranism" (pp. 131ff.). The modern student of church history will find this chapter of great value and interest in view of present-day developments in America. It as well as the other chapters of this biography awakens a desire in one for similar biographical sketches of American Lutheran churchmen and educators. Biographies, at least, have the prospect of being read. They give us insights into the life and work of individuals and church bodies which we otherwise do not learn to know. Reading them we have an opportunity to see and to hear these men in their daily surrounding and manifold activities.

Whether Lars Boe was a sample of Lutheran church leadership is a question which has called forth conflicting answers within the Norwegian Lutheran Church itself. The author is very frank in quoting utterances both of commendation and censure (cf. p. 158). Of all opinions expressed by his contemporaries that of his political opponent — for Dr. Boe was pastor, educator, and legislator in one — we deem the most telling. The reader will find it on pages 46 and 47 of a biography which as a fascinating account of an individualist makes absorbing reading. P. PETERS.

Martin Luther, A Narrative Poem. By Theo. Huggenvik. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis 15, Minnesota. Price: 15 cents.

We gladly recommend this narrative poem, which is a clear-ringing testimony to the Wittenberg Reformer. Our young peoples' societies will certainly give welcome to this poem as a very fitting number on one of their Reformation-Day Programs. P. PETERS.

From the Nile to the Waters of Damascus. By Dr. William Arndt. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis 18, Missouri. Price: \$2.00.

Dr. Arndt succeeds admirably in acting as a guide for his readers on his sightseeing tour through the Holy Land. Beginning at Alexandria he first lets us see the pyramids and the valley of the kings before he takes us to Lydda and from there to Jerusalem. From Jerusalem trips are made to the south and the north until we finally reach Damascus. Having spent two months of 1947 in Palestine during the most favorable season of the year, early spring, and having jotted down his impressions in the evening of every day's journey, Dr. Arndt was well prepared, when he

arrived home, to write a book on the locales visited by him. He is able to lead his readers through 30 places and more and to tell them those things about each place which the reader does not know or which he does not tire of hearing. The reader is at all times able to follow his guide without being lost in a maze of details and detours. The details mentioned are such as to give one a clear picture of the places visited and to aid one in remembering certain characteristics. Sunday school teachers, pastors, and parochial school teachers, for whom this little book of 160 pages is written, will benefit much by the reading of it. The presentations are supplemented by no less than 100 pictures furnished by a traveling companion, the Rev. Erich H. Kiehl, and therefore serve to illustrate the descriptions given by the author. A travelogue on pages IX and X help the reader to retrace his steps at any time and to use this account of Palestine as a handy reference book. In short, we owe the author a vote of thanks for having taken us along on his trip.

P. PETERS.

Evangelisch-Lutherischer Volkskalender auf das Jahr 1949. Als Lizenzausgabe der Evang. Verlagsanstalt Berlin im Verlag Johannes Herrmann, Zwickau (Sachsen) erschienen. 88 Seiten. Preis DM —,90.

Wir heißen diesen unsern Gast aus dem Auslande herzlich willkommen und empfehlen ihn gerne denjenigen unter unsern Lesern, die noch die deutsche Sprache lieb haben und sich gerne an deutschen Schriften christlichen Inhaltes erbauen. Auch dieses Mal hat sich der Verlag Joh. Herrmann, der in diesem Herbst sein 75jähriges Jubiläum feiert, alle erdenkliche Mühe gegeben diesen Jahrgang des Volkskalenders seinen Vorgängern würdig zur Seite zu stellen. Vor allem möchten wir unsere Leser auf die Jubiläumsaufsätze hinweisen, den über Katharina von Bora, die vor 450 Jahren das Licht der Welt erblickt hat, wie auch den, der uns über die 70 Jahre Naemi-Wilke-Stift in Guben an der Görlitzer Meisse berichtet. Die 75 Jahre, die die Verlagsbuchhandlung und Buchdruckerei Johannes Herrmann in Zwickau (Sachsen) im Dienst am christlichen Buch gestanden hat, wird mit einem Artikel aus dem „Deutschen Pfarrerberblatt“ gewürdigt. Das Verzeichnis der Anschriften der Pastoren und Gemeinden der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Freikirche (48 Pastoren), der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche im früheren Ostpreußen (66 Pastoren), der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Flüchtlingsmissionskirche (9 Pastoren), der Ev.-Luth. Freikirche in Finnland (3 Pastoren) und der Ev.-Luth. Freikirche im Elsaß (4 Pastoren) geben dem Volkskalender einen würdigen Abschluß. Dieses Verzeichnis ist deswegen von so großer Bedeutung für unsere Leser, weil es Listen der überaus vielen Predigtplätze der deutschen Freikirchen führt, die uns so recht die rege Missionstätigkeit der freikirchlichen Pastoren vor Augen führt. Der Kalender sollte weite Verbreitung in unsern Synodalkreisen finden. Martin Herrmann, 834 Greenwood Avenue, St. Joseph, Michigan, ist bereit, Bestellungen in Empfang zu nehmen und an seinen Onkel Joh. Herrmann weiterzuleiten. Es lege ein jeder der Bestellung etwa 25 ct\$ bei.

P. Peters.

Quartalschrift

Theological Quarterly

Volume 46

October, 1949

Number 4

LETTERS ADDRESSED TO LUTHERAN PASTORS

BY PROFESSOR HERMANN SASSE

III

On the Problem of the Relation Between
the Reformed and Lutheran Church

(Translation by Ralph Gehrke)

Dear Brethren in the Ministry:

Many friendly responses to my first letter (Concerning the Status of the Lutheran Churches in the World) cause me to now discuss *the problem of the relation between the Lutheran and the Reformed church* viewed on the background of the experiences of more remote history and of the most recent past.

1.

"I believe in the Holy Catholic Church, and sincerely regret that it does not at present exist." This sentence, which would be blasphemy in the mouth of every other person, but that of the great, pious Anglican archbishop, who said it, reflects the attitude which men assume over against a divided Christendom, and that not now for the first time in our ecumenical age. "At present there is no united church." Thus the Gnostic Christians must have said, when they were confronted by the "intolerance" of a John, of an Ignatius, of an Irenaeus or of that body, which in spite of the fact that it was considerably smaller, nevertheless laid claim to the name: the "great" and "catholic" church. "At present the church has no unity." Thus those men must have thought, who living in Rome in the middle of the second century and wanting to become Christians found themselves placed before the choice of three

rival churches, that of the Valentinians, of the Marcionites, and the "catholic" church, even as today the heathen of the great cities of India and China must shake their heads as they meet up with the variety of Christian denominations. "At present the Catholic Church no longer exists." Thus the Roman police of the fourth century must have thought, when they had to help the rival successors of Peter garrison or "cleanse" the churches and restore quiet and order among the sceptically mocking population of the metropolis, while at the same time Cyril of Jerusalem advised the newly-baptized in the explanation of the Article of Faith Concerning the One, Holy Catholic Church as follows (Cat. 18, 26): "When you enter a city, do not simply ask: 'Where is the House of the Lord?' but 'Where is the catholic church?' . . ." "At present the *Una Sancta* does not exist, or it no longer exists, or it does not yet exist." That has been the conclusion of the world, also of the "Christian" world in all ages and it will remain its conclusion until the dear Judgment Day.

But wherever people know what the Church of which the New Testament speaks is, — the Church, which is the people of God, the body of Christ, the temple of the Holy Ghost, — there people know that belief in one, holy, catholic and apostolic church is not belief in an ideal which is to be or is not to be realized. For the one Church of God, to speak with our Lutheran confessions is no *civitas Platonica*, but a reality in the world, a reality which must be believed and which is believed only by him, who believes in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. Belief in the Church is included in belief in the Triune God, who gives witness of Himself to us in the Holy Scripture. For this reason the Article Concerning the Church belongs to the Creed as a true article of comfort, as the VII. and VIII. article of the Augustana puts it: "And the article of the Church Catholic or Universal, which is gathered together from every nation under the sun, is very comforting and highly necessary. For the number of the godless, who despise the Word, bitterly hate it and persecute it as much as possible, is much greater, wellnigh innumerable, as for instance the Turks, Mohammedans, other tyrants, heretics, etc. For this reason the true teaching and the Church are often so utterly suppressed and disappear, as if there

were no Church, which has happened under the papacy, and it often seems as if the Church has completely perished. Nevertheless, in order that we may not despair, but steadfastly and heartily believe that one Christian Church lives and exists on earth . . . , that the Lord Christ is also here on earth, in that group that is called Church, and daily works, forgives sins, hears their prayers, daily uplifts His own in affliction with rich, strong comfort and refreshes them ever again and again, the most comforting doctrine is placed in the Creed: I believe one Catholic, Universal Christian Church!" For this reason then we Christians need this article. And to that end we pray it daily in the Creed "*ne desperemus*" (lest we despair) — as the Latin text says. Indeed without this article we would have to despair, and whoever does not understand this article, must despair, if he sees the condition of Christendom on earth and asks for the *one* Church of God.

2.

If a generation of Christian history ever needed this comfort of the true belief in the *una sancta ecclesia perpetuo mansura*, then it is our generation. The present-day Ecumenical Movement has many roots and many aspects. But one of its deepest motives, which often hides itself behind an altogether culpable theological superficiality and a shocking lack of spiritual maturity, is the dark feeling that not only the so-called "Christian" nations, but that also that part of the world which has remained Christian — present-day Christianity with respect to that which it calls Christian faith and Christian Church — is now in the midst not only of what was twenty years ago termed a crisis but of a catastrophe! With the mass apostasy of many millions (which a specious group of statistics, seemingly rich in comfort, really tries to hide) something has also been shattered in the hearts of those who have outwardly still remained with the church. True enough, much faithful confession, much faith showing itself strong in deed, much fervent prayer are still to be found even today; and in contrast to the past there has even been an increase in the faithfulness of confessing the faith even to the point of martyrdom, in the practical action of living faith and in fervency on the part of the small circles, which live behind the rich.

destruction-ripe facades of the older National and Mass churches, some of which have already been destroyed (Russia and the whole East) and some of which are ripe for the fall. But these small circles make no great impact on the world, on general culture, not only because they are much too small now in the age of mass-peoples but also because their missionary power seems to be hindered or even entirely wiped out in a manner which cannot be humanly explained. Since a quarter of a century Christianity has been on the defensive in Europe and its gains in the mission fields, when compared with the missions of the first centuries or of the early Middle Ages, stand in shockingly poor contrast to the amount of money expended. In this situation, in which all churches of Christendom find themselves in equal measure — the Roman Church too, which in our days for the first time is beginning to become aware of this fact —, the Christians of the various confessions and denominations look at one another, ask, and seek an answer: the Catholic from the Protestant, the Orthodox from the Anglican, the Reformed from the Lutheran. And in confessing with one another and — necessarily so — in opposition to one another the "*Credo unam sanctam catholicam ecclesiam,*" they ask for the comfort, which is given to the believing Christian, when it seems, according to all human power of observation, "as if the Church doesn't exist," "as if she has entirely disappeared."

3.

But this quest for comfort from the Article of Faith Concerning the Church is something, which must change the relation of the confessional churches to one another very deeply and which already has changed it in many respects, and therein perhaps lies the proper sense of the Ecumenical Movement. As a union movement it is senseless. One must soberly keep the facts in mind. There is no possibility of uniting the catholic churches of the East and West. If after the Russian Revolution of 1917 Roman Catholicism believed that the remnants of the Eastern Church would now join Rome and that the oft-attempted but always frustrated union would finally come to pass, it must realize today how greatly it was mistaken. The Church of the East is arising, but not with the help of the West, as people thought.

She is arising in all her splendor, with her glorious liturgy and with that profound theology with which she, a seemingly dead and ossified structure, already shamed the West in the century between Chamjakow and the late Bjerdjajew, just as the Eastern Church of antiquity once shamed the Latins. And she is arising — with all the wretchedness and unspeakable distress of the Byzantine and Russian State Church: an organization which lies helpless, delivered up to the political powers of the world. Should Moscow or the West appoint the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople — self-evidently, of course, with due respect for the directions of church law? *Tertium non datur*. The “Iron Curtain” has not only a political but also a religious side. The Pope and the Patriarch of Moscow speak with one another today just as Nicolaus I spoke with Photios, as the Legates of Leo IX spoke with Michael Caerularius. And the sad fates of the Roman cardinals in Jugoslavia and Hungary also have their exact parallels in the past. What human power imagines that it can unite these churches? They themselves will never come to be united, because the rift between them has also non-ecclesiastical reasons. And in so far as the ecclesiastical reasons which divide them are concerned, it is the Vatican which has by its completion of the Doctrine of the Papacy made irrevocable the division which began of inner necessity in the century when the Pseudo-Isidorian church law was introduced. And it ill becomes us Evangelicals to view the fight between the two catholic sisters with a feeling of our own superiority. For it is the whole church of Christ on earth which must suffer in this unwholesome conflict.

Our fathers in the time of Orthodoxy had no illusions as to who the Pope or the Jesuits were. But they believed in the existence of the Church even in the mission churches of the Jesuits in America and in East Asia, even as we today believe its existence wherever the means of grace are still present in the communion of the Antichrist, who today again is so clear to us — and that doesn't mean that we overlook the very similar forms of the Antichrist in Protestantism. We know that we are bound together in the *one* Church of God with all of those “who from time to time in the world, from the rising to the setting of the sun truly believe in Christ, who have the *one*

Gospel, *one* Christ, *one* Sacrament, and are ruled by *one* Holy Ghost, even though they have differing ceremonies" (Apol. to C. A., 7 and 8, 10f.). And even though in this life we only believe in the existence of this bond, but cannot realize it, because we dare not declare ourselves at one with false doctrine, still this belief is a reality, to which we can give expression also without a union.

And even so it is with the churches of the Protestant world. If Stanley Jones is now traveling through the cities of America, in order to work in great mass meetings for a united Protestant Church of America, after the plan of the Evangelical Church in Germany (EKiD), that is no genuine ecumenical work, but rather a unionism, as a result of which the Church of Christ would have to die. Who would be served by having a "United Church" in every country to take the place of the old confessional churches? These union churches would only be new denominations with watered-down confessions — or with no confessions at all — in all events with entirely different dogmatic coloring. The "United Churches" of Canada, North India and South India are as far from one another as their miserable predecessors: the seven or eight different union-churches in Germany, which no one can unite, because they have entirely different confessional foundations and catechisms. Or has German Protestantism perhaps come closer to union by substituting for the Lutheran and the Heidelberger catechisms, *e. g.*, the Palatinate Catechism in the union-churches of Ludwigshafen, and the Catechism of Baden beyond the Rhine bridge in Mannheim, while letting these two old catechisms stand next to each other in Prussia and by uniting them in Hanau by the genial invention of a "book binder's union": printing them one right after the other?

No, the churches should once and for all declare themselves together with such senseless unionistic machinations which can only aggravate the division of Christendom, in order that they may devote themselves again to that, which alone can be the sense of legitimate ecumenical work: the ordering anew of the relation of the great confessions to one another. Instead of wanting to make the *Una Sancta* visible, which is as impossible as wanting to make the Trinity visible — for the *Una Sancta* is an article

of faith, not an article of sight (*Sehartikel*) —, the churches of Christendom should learn to live with one another, and without giving up the polemics that are necessary for the sake of the truth, they should learn to speak with one another in such a manner that it becomes evident that we really believe in the *Una Sancta*. If this and nothing else is the sense of legitimate Ecumenical Work, then this is especially the purpose of the new ordering of the reciprocal relation between the Lutheran and Reformed church.

4.

For here something must be done, unless finally in all the world the churches which still hold fast to the *Sola Scriptura* of the Reformation are to suffer greatest loss. For the legitimate offense of a church-split for the sake of correct doctrine has unfortunately become a "scandal" because of the relation that has existed between Lutherans and Reformed up to the present, a "scandal" which cries unto heaven as much as the 1000-year-old scandal of the relation between the Orthodox and the Roman church. The "scandal" does not consist in this that the two confessions which recognize the *Sola Scriptura* conduct theological investigations with one another and try to win one another over. All that must and can be done. But political motives enter in, just as was the case in the discussions between Eastern and Western catholicism. Formerly the thing that always put the discussion on the wrong track was the cultural and political superiority of the West over politically backward Central Europe and the Scandinavian lands, which except for short episodes always remained the "Province." How many sons of the princes favored Calvinism because it was the Protestantism of the more refined West? How many Lutherans up until our very own days have made the whole problem of examining and coming to an understanding of Calvinism so easy for themselves by explaining it as springing up from the Gallicism which they so despised? That goes back from the famous or infamous genealogy which Hitler constructed past Bismarck and Frederick the Great to Luther, a genealogy which plays such a great role also in our days and against which the Lutheran Church of France has had to defend itself. But when even the great Anglo-Catholic student of liturgy,

Dom Gregory Dix, in his great book "The Shape of the Liturgy" (1945, 3rd Edition, 1947) hides his ignorance of Luther and his incapability of entering into the Great Reformer's doctrine of the sacraments and of the liturgy behind a senseless and superficial parallel: Luther-Hitler, then one is forced to ask, How long must such things continue?

In Germany itself it has now seemingly become the style to identify the anti-socialistic, anti-democratic, nationalistic political *Weltanschauung* with Lutheranism, as in the good old days of 1848-1945. Nothing has been more offensive in Karl Barth than his criticism of Germany's original mistake (*Erbfehler*) — a criticism, which, though it is indeed hidden under many errors, is nevertheless thorough-going, although his criticism has not gone nearly so far as that which the great Lutheran August Vilmar directs at things German. Hans Asmussen, who however since Barmen and the Confessional Synod at Halle with its proclamation of unrestricted communion fellowship really became the foremost champion of the New Union in Germany, is now presumably considered a good Lutheran by many ever since the moment that he opposed Karl Barth's political theology. Also in this matter the political investigation (*Auseinandersetzung*) of the confessions must cease from each shoving the blame for the rise of the "German Christians" on the other. It is a historical fact that this movement first was organized in the union-churches of Nassau and Prussia, and that Ludwig Mueller was elected Land-Bishop of Prussia in an entirely legal manner. But it is also a fact that the "German Christians" would never have come to the full strength which they finally won, if the Lutheran territorial-churches together with other representatives of their churches had not at that "National Synod in Wittenberg" in September, 1933, opened the door wide to them by electing Ludwig Mueller as Reichsbischof, simply because he was the "confidant of the Führer." It is really true, *e. g.*, that the territorial church of Bavaria was deeply influenced by National-Socialism. And deep down it is still influenced by it today, as Walther Kuenneth's book, "The Great Apostacy," which presents the one single big excuse, proves; as does also the other official book of the Bavarian church-administration, that comical portrayal of the church-fight, in which

all those things are omitted which happened in Bavaria so that the joining up with the National-Socialist movement might not be neglected, a movement which at that time was also a movement in the Frankish people. That is no excuse now that this portrayal ("*Apocalyptic Harbingers*") was written by the Augsburg myth-maker who has made a name for himself under the name of "Master Guntram of Augsburg."

All of us know that the examples now mentioned, the number of which can easily be increased, are not just occasional happenings, but are mistakes which should cause German Lutheranism earnestly to examine itself, especially since these examples have by no means been restricted to a special part of German Lutheranism, but had corresponding parallels in almost all of its groups, and were bolstered up and defended by a pseudo-Lutheran theology. And as necessary as it may now be, not to let these painful remembrances all too quickly pass into oblivion, so little can the discussion (*Auseinandersetzung*) between the Protestant confessions be aided by them. No, the confessions have nothing here which they can throw up to one another. And we can only give the advice to churches outside of Germany to touch upon this theme only with a *Mea culpa, mea maxima culpa*. For essentially the normal Protestant of all countries and of all confessions is exactly that which the "German Christians" were here with us. And perhaps the average Catholic, if we examine him closely, is also the same. Even as we reserve the right to expose the political sins of the Catholics, the Reformed, the Anglicans and Methodists of England and America, so also we gladly will in all humility receive instruction on the neglects, mistakes and deep sins of Lutheranism and of its theology and learn from this criticism what we can. But in all respects we must be clear on this that this debate makes sense only if it brings us to the final differences in the understanding of Holy Scripture. Here and not in any political consequences or inconsequences lies that which divides also the Lutherans and the Reformed. That is the thing that our churches have to discuss, of which they must learn to speak in an altogether new way, if their reciprocal relation is to change.

5.

If we are to come to a better, more fruitful, thorough-going discussion, then first of all that dilettantism with which the differences between the confessions has so long now been handled must be entirely rooted out. Which theologian would want to answer on Judgment Day for the boundless superficiality with which the unionists of the nineteenth century manipulated and despised the differences in doctrine? "The conflicting differences of doctrine which have existed up to now have been replaced in accordance with well-founded reasons by a viewpoint which agrees with the clear expressions of the Gospel," says Paragraph 4 of the Palatinate union document of 1818. What prize arrogance on the part of theological ignoramuses, who have no conception of the responsibility which their office has placed upon them over against the Christian congregation! But has our time really passed beyond this point? Do we not hear again and again that the modern exegesis of the Communion Texts has brought us beyond the conflict of the classic doctrines of communion held by the Lutherans and the Reformed in the century of the Reformation, and that it is time to draw conclusions from this exegesis in an official "binding discussion on Communion" and formulate a new common doctrine of the Sacrament of the Altar? Do we not have the same situation with respect to the doctrine of predestination? Has not Karl Barth struck out on the way to a new doctrine of predestination, in which classic Calvinism is abandoned in favor of an election in Christ, similar to the one Luther taught? So in the present-day Reformed church we are really not confronting the Calvinism of the sixteenth century, although the modern Reformed church has never *expressis verbis* rejected Zwingli and Calvin with respect to the *Decretum Horribile*. On the other hand, Lutheranism is also no longer the same as it was in the sixteenth century. The majority of Lutheran pastors in Germany do not even think of teaching the Fourth and Fifth Chief Parts of the Small Catechism in the sense in which Luther and the Old Lutheran church meant them. Rather they are closer to Melancthon, if not to Calvin, than to the Reformer of Wittenberg. Actually, if it were only a matter of uniting the present Lutheran and the present Reformed church; then that would be

as easy as it was in the beginning of the nineteenth century, even though our unions would look quite different from those of that time.

But isn't this the real crux of the matter, namely, that in spite of all theological studies about the Reformation, we are as far removed from the actual thing with which the Reformation was concerned as the fathers of the unions of the nineteenth century — at least the majority not only of our congregation members, but also of the theologians? And must not this matter be the central point of a discussion between the two confessions, which is finally nothing else but a matter of the Holy Scripture? Whether or not we unite or not is not dependent on the congruous or incongruous opinions of men, but on the Word of God which binds us all, the Word of God which has been given to the Church and which is binding upon all generations of the Church? Why doesn't the present-day Reformed church judge Zwingli a heretic, even though it maintains that it no longer shares his doctrine of communion? Why doesn't it reject Calvin's doctrine of predestination? Why doesn't that Lutheran territorial church, in which every superintendent can without condemnation brand Luther's doctrine of the Real Presence as heresy — in which territorial church would that be impossible? — make this judgment its own? That simply doesn't happen, evidently out of reverence for the fathers.

It is a noteworthy fact, that the Reformed church, although she has never taken her confessions as seriously as the Lutheran church, yea, although in whole regions she has put her confessions out of force, still never went as far as the Church of England, which indeed still holds fast to binding all her ministers to the 39 Articles for legal reasons, but in practice ignores them so completely that the archbishop of Canterbury could answer the question as to where the doctrine of the church was to be found, by explaining: In the *Apostolicum* and in the Book of Common Prayer! But that is not the case in the Reformed Church, at least not there, where people have come to a serious consideration of the Reformation and of the Word of God. Wherever the Word of God has been rediscovered — and that is everywhere in the Reformed world where the theological revival which sprang

from Karl Barth really took effect: in Switzerland, in Holland, in Scotland, and in America — there people have gained respect for the confessions of the Reformation, for the Helvetica, for the Gallicana, the Belgica, the Scotica and others, even though their attitude toward them is naturally quite another one than that of the Lutherans toward the symbolical books of their church. And even the modernistic Lutheranism in Europe and America has not dared in our time to demand the nullification (*Ausserkraftsetzung*) of the Invariata, rather it contents itself with reading its views into the Augustana.

Whence comes this? The main reason could be that the theologian who has gone through the new theological revival is not the liberal of thirty years ago, who boldly set his own ego up against the church and brought the doctrine of the church into subjection to his own personal criticism. In addition moreover, ecclesiastical feeling has become so strong that any supposedly new exegetical understanding is only then recognized to be binding on the church, when it has been received by the church and thus has ceased to be the doctrine of individuals. For that reason Hans Asmussen, the most zealous proponent of a new doctrine of communion based on the present exegetical situation, wants a discussion of communion between the Lutherans and the Reformed, which should be officially called by the church, *i. e.*, by the EKID, and which would therefore be binding. When finally such a discussion on communion took place by virtue of the resolutions of the Second Conference of Churches (*Kirchenkonferenz*) of Treysa 1947, then it was the late New Testament scholar from Halle, Schniewind, who with all firmness rejected the doctrinal binding force of this discussion and its results. He did that in the humble wisdom of a great scholar, who was conscious of the limitations of modern theology.

6.

Now if it is a fact that these two confessional churches, whose character has been stamped by the *Sola Scriptura* of the Reformation, have not been able to achieve unity as churches, then exceedingly much depends on their seeking a new relation toward one another, on their learning from the experience of

400 years of fruitless discussion (*Auseinandersetzung*). That would mean first of all giving up the manner of polemics and the unionistic machinations which have existed up to now. We must understand the tragic manner in which these churches have been speaking past one another (*das tragische Aneinander-Vorbeireden der beiden Kirchen*). For the Reformed no church boundary has existed over against Lutheranism since Zwingli's and Luther's day, only the boundary of a theological school, since as far as they are concerned the Evangelical church is the church of the *Sola Scriptura*. All Evangelical churches are united in this that the Holy Scriptures alone and nothing else is the source and norm of revelation. Among Evangelicals (used in the above sense) there are various ways of understanding Scripture. The Anglicans and the Lutherans have not been able, so they think, to free themselves entirely from the Catholic traditions, which were added to the Scripture. Calvin — and his disciples and successors have followed him in this — considered it his life's task to bring the other confessions, especially the Lutherans with their "sacramentalism," back to the church of the *Sola Scriptura*, for which the sacrament is nothing else but the *verbum visibile*, and in this effort to use to good advantage the help of those individuals or groups in Lutheranism who were themselves unsure in the doctrine of the sacrament and thus bring about the true "biblical" union in "the Church Reformed According to God's Word." Unionism belongs to the essence of the Reformed Church, and in Germany unionism, viewed historically and dogmatically, is the fruit of the continual missionary attempts which Calvinism must of inner necessity make.

Now a few examples of how this worked out in the church-fight (*Kirchenkampf*) since 1933. The long-term champion of the Reformed Church in the Province of Brandenburg, Martin Albertz, now Professor of Reformed Theology in Berlin, even in our days defended the Prussian King's (Friedrich Wilhelm I) prohibition of the Lutheran Liturgy in Lutheran Brandenburg. The king, he maintained, only acted in accordance with the example of the pious kings of Israel such as Josiah. That happened in the selfsame days when the National Socialist state was interfering deeply in the rights and inner life of the Evangelical

churches of Germany and when the whole world was protesting this coercing of consciences. And another scene from the church-fight (*Kirchenkampf*): In an evening session of the Theological Committee of the Second Confessional Synod at Dahlem 1934 the undersigned said to Karl Barth: You cannot demand of us the abrogation of the Augustana at this moment, when our bishops (Meiser and Wurm) have been robbed of their freedom." Barth's answer was: "Why not?" The greatest example of this is the "Theological Declaration of Barmen." Every attempt from Lutheran quarters to contest the right of a mixed synod to make a declaration of what true and false doctrine is, was suppressed. Not even five minutes on the floor was given to anyone who for reasons of conscience wanted to point out this contradiction, in spite of all pleas that were made in the plenary session (*im Plenum*). The Lutherans were comforted with the explanation that this was only a matter of a theological declaration, not of a confession. "Isn't it true that this was only a theological *declaration*?" a bishop later said to Karl Barth. "Isn't it true that this was a *confession* on your part!" was the answer of Barth. And meanwhile in wide areas of German Protestantism the Barmen Declaration has been elevated to the rank of a confession that in practice stands even far above the confessions of the Reformation, and recently Archbishop Fisher of Canterbury, on the occasion of a visit at the Theological School in Wuppertal, moved by the *genius loci*, recognized even the ecumenical significance of this "confession." The Reformed Church of Germany has fully accepted it as such a confession.

This church politics corresponds to the politics of the Reformed church since Calvin's day, who already sought to include all the churches that began with the Reformation in separation from Rome, with magnanimous tolerance of doctrinal differences in one united Evangelical Church. The old missionary zeal has still remained among the Reformed, who have sought to win the Lutherans, sometimes with political means and also with the force of the State, as in Brandenburg-Prussia from the first Reformed Kurfürst to the last Hohenzollern. Characteristic of this is the self-evidency with which the Lascian Congregation of Exiles from London in 1553 demanded of the Lutherans in Denmark,

Wismar, Rostock and Hamburg not only an asylum but also a "binding discussion" and therewith their recognition of the Reformed doctrine of communion. The Lutherans could not grant that. For them the Evangelical church was not only the church of *Sola Scriptura* — this is what all the sects of the Middle Ages since the Waldensians have advocated in a legalistic manner — but also the church of *Sola Fide* and of that doctrine, which is inseparably bound up with it, the doctrine of the Real Presence. The Lutheran Church, in as far as she remained true to her confessions, especially to the Augustana Invariata and to the Formula of Concord, on her part could not but see in certain doctrines of the Reformed, — especially the means of grace, and very strikingly in the understanding of Holy Communion — a false doctrine which destroys the church (*eine die Kirche zerstörende Irrlehre*). She was therefore compelled to — with all personal Christian love toward erring brethren, which is unmistakably and honestly attested to in the Foreword to the Formula of Concord — to deny church and communion fellowship to the Reformed and she must do that even today. This refusal has never been understood and is never understood by the Lutherans as a violation of Christian love, or as confessional obstinacy (*Rechthaberei*), but as obedience to the eternal truth of the Holy Scripture and also as an act of loving care (*Seelsorge*) for those, who would at the very least have to come into the greatest conflicts of conscience, if they would take part of the Lutheran Communion, without considering the proclamation which is inseparably bound up with it as true. This presupposition of the Lutheran action was not however understood by the Reformed. They, and especially their congregations, did not grasp the fact that in the eyes of the Lutheran church they as such who denied the Real Presence of the true Body and Blood of the Lord in, with, and under the forms of bread and wine had to be heretics. Thus began that unhappy discussion (*Auseinandersetzung*) which could not for centuries be anything else but theological talking-past-one-another (*theologisches Aneinandervorbeireden*) and which could be nothing else for the Lutheran church but a desperate battle for existence against the unionistic politics of the Reformed.

7.

The decisive question for both churches now is whether this fight should continue *ad infinitum*. For the Reformed must realize that they will not succeed in absorbing Lutheranism. In Germany, to be sure, the Lutheran territorial churches have become practically crypto-Calvinistic. But that still hasn't made them Reformed. The selfsame Lutherans who set aside the doctrine of the Real Presence turn to such un-Lutheran, pseudo-Lutheran movements as the Berneuchen Movement, in which anthroposophic motives combine with such as come from the Catholicism of the East and West. We do not want to contest the fact that the Berneuchen Movement as a liturgical movement has a certain justification in so far as it seeks to fill a certain vacuum in our church. Indeed, one would have to welcome it, if it were to remain on the ground of the confession. The discipline of prayer, both of private and congregational prayer, the understanding of the liturgy in general, has been widely lost. The Lutheran Church of Germany could well have used a true liturgical movement which rested on the un-surrenderable principles of the Lutheran Reformation and which would have expressed their entire "catholicity." But instead of that we are visited by a movement in which *Sola Fide* and *Sola Scriptura* together with the Real Presence in Luther's sense are surrendered. We know of many a Lutheran theologian, who mistakenly got into this movement and is of the honest conviction that he is finding there what the Lutheran church really needs. But one has only to consider the Berneuchen Mass with its borrowing from all Catholic churches, to know that it has nothing to do with the mass, of which the XXIV Article of the Augustana speaks and as our church has celebrated it for 200 years. The most evident proof of this is the fact that theologians who are consciously Reformed, and deny the Real Presence, welcome this movement and belong to it. Thus in fact Lutheranism is not converted to the Reformed church by the infiltration of Crypto-Calvinism, but it is ruined. Lutheranism, which arises on the basis of Reformed propaganda and under its leadership, is a Lutheranism which cannot please the Reformed church; a Lutheranism which must be still more strange and more repulsive than the Old Lutheranism; a Luther-

anism, which is really at the point of returning to the "darknesses of the papacy." For who among the Berneuchens is still able to recognize the Antichrist in the papacy?

We must seek to reach mutual understanding and mutual discussion (*Miteinanderreden*) between the Lutheran and Reformed churches on other paths. The presupposition for this is the realization that the old attempts at union, also the so-called "Confessional Union" of Barmen only bring more water to Rome's water-wheel, because they have toyed with and finally have made ridiculous the duty of taking doctrine seriously: the question about pure doctrine, upon which the Reformation rested. The relation between the Lutheran and the Reformed churches up to now has hurt the character of both churches, in that it has ruined legitimate and necessary polemics. A church like the Lutheran church, which for 411 years has had to expend its best strength in a battle against the missionary attempts of the Reformed, is always in danger of becoming nervous, anxious, and narrow. And to a church such as the Reformed church, which was convinced that it must carry out its missionary activity on the Lutheran church under all circumstances, worldly wisdom (*Weltklugheit*) and secular politics have necessarily become a danger again and again. Thus both churches, the Lutheran as well as the Reformed, suffered great losses. They have not learned that which they can and should learn. Today they are farther from the unity of the Church and their fathers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, who knew the doctrine of the other church not only in its caricature but in its reality. The confessional churches of that time wrestled with one another. They resorted to polemics against one another. But in that very thing they were nearer to the eternal truth of God than their successors today.

8.

Are men to be found in both churches, who possess the human greatness of spirit (*Seelengrösse*) and at the same time the humility taught by the Holy Spirit, to leave these dangerous paths of seeking a settlement (*Auseinandersetzung*) which have so often become harmful both to the Lutheran and to the Reformed church? For Germany the hope is not great, since every-

thing here has become set by centuries of history and by a frightful dilettantism, with which people have side-stepped the legitimate fight for the pure doctrine in the EKID and in the VELKD and thus have eternalized this unwholesome fight with church politics. The churches of the Northern countries have here a certain freedom, because they do not have the Reformed within their own country, and likewise the churches of America have this freedom, where up to now they have lived side-by-side and have gotten along with one another. Should it not be possible for the Reformed, in so far as they are really Reformed or again become Reformed, and the Lutherans, in so far as they are really Lutheran in the sense of their confessional writings or again become Lutheran — should it not be possible that the representatives of both churches conscientiously respect the existing boundary which separates their churches, to honestly heed the convictions of the other church, should it not be possible for them to set over against them their own confession including their rejection of the opposite doctrine and in this way — perhaps in one generation — come closer to one another than is at present the case? And when one says: the time is too short, the end of this apocalyptic time is perhaps very near, — now, if Rome doesn't give up one iota of its doctrine in this apocalyptic time, how much more must not the Lutheran church hold fast to her unabridged doctrine, to that doctrine of which she dares even today and, mindful of the account which she must give before the judgment seat of Christ, confess that this doctrine "is taken from God's Word and well grounded in it?" (F. C. Sol. Decl. de comp., 5). And if in this generation we must come before the throne of the Everlasting Judge, — He will not ask us at the Last Judgment about the efficiency of our organization, but about our faithfulness, about our belief in His Holy Church in the sense of that great comforting article in our Confessions, of which we spoke above. And *faith* is much more necessary for such theological-confessional existence than for the activity of unionism, where human idealism is always mistaken for faith worked by the Holy Spirit. A new ordering of the relation between the two great confessions of the sixteenth century which is born of this faith, of really taking the belief in the *Una Sancta perpetuo mansura* seriously, is

perhaps the test which will show whether we are evangelical Christians at all, children of the *Sola Scriptura*. But as things now stand, this fight which wears out the theologians and disrupts the church must lead to the dissolution and disintegration of Protestantism and to the triumph of Rome. May God in good time grant to the Evangelical churches men who reverse the course before it is too late — before the night cometh when no man can work!

* * * *

Perhaps these questions, warnings, and admonitions of a Lutheran theologian who for more than two decades has stood in the fight for genuine confession and true union and who in the course of the battle has said all these things, are coming too late. Perhaps later church history will view the year 1948 as the year of the great decisions which can never be recalled, the year of the establishment of the EKiD and of the World Council of Churches in its present form, determined by Reformed Christianity. Perhaps the process will irrevocably continue, a process which is uniting the Anglican Church and the Free Church of England and the churches of Protestantism in America according to the plan of Stanley Jones, even as the Evangelical confessions in Germany have been linked together in the new joint-church federation, which transcends the boundaries of zones and the old confessional boundaries. Perhaps in this way an entirely new type of Protestant church, entirely unknown in the past anywhere in the world, will arise, a church which is not yet fully a church in the sense of unity of faith, but rather a church-alliance (*Kirchenbund*). Perhaps we must let this process take its course, a course which can end in nothing else but in a syncretism which will ultimately resign the Christian dogma to Rome. But as long as there is yet a Lutheranism which is still true to its confessions, it must stand watch and give witness against this surrender of that which for Luther was the meaning of the Reformation, because it is nothing else but the Gospel of Him, who alone is our righteousness and who through the means of grace of His Gospel and of His true Body and Blood builds His Church on earth. "His work no one can hinder," not even the folly and

the wilfulness of men. For it is not our Church, but His Church. And this Church is called *perpetuo mansura* in distinction to those churches which we can try to build. That we have learned from Martin Luther, and Luther learned it from Holy Scripture. And in this sense we will believe and confess the comforting article concerning the *Una Sancta*, my brethren. We believe it even as the Scripture teaches it to us and in no other way. We confess it even as all of us should confess all articles of faith: not only in word, but in deed.

Bound by ties of Faith and Confession,

I greet you,

HERMANN SASSE.

PRAYER FELLOWSHIP

Essay read before the Minnesota District Pastoral Conference
assembled in New Ulm, April 26-28, by Joh. P. Meyer.

(Continued from July issue)

II. The Unity of the Church

When Luther with the words quoted above in jubilant notes shouted forth his joy over his membership in the Church and over his sharing in all her glorious blessings, he stressed both the number and variety of the gifts on the one hand and the absolute unity on the other.

The flesh often takes occasion from the very choicest gifts, which the exalted Christ is giving to His Church on earth for her edification, to degrade and disrupt the Church. Paul was a special gift to the Church; so was Apollos a special gift, but of an altogether different type. Paul cultivated plainness, directness, and simplicity in declaring the testimony of God. He came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom. His opponents even said that he was "rude in speech" (*ιδιότης τῷ λόγῳ* — 2 Cor. 11, 6). Apollos, on the other hand, was an *ἀνὴρ λόγιος*, *δυνατὸς ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς*, an "eloquent man, mighty in the scriptures" (Acts 18, 24). — Neither of these men abused his special gift to cause disruption in the Church. Paul used his gift of restraint to

demonstrate *ad oculos* the intrinsic divine power of the Gospel, which, without the use of "enticing words," is "mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds . . . and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ," while Apollos used his eloquence to convince the Jews mightily (*εδιτόμως*) in public debate from the Scriptures that Jesus is the Christ of prophecy. — It is well known, however, how the Corinthians abused the splendid spiritual gifts of these two men in a way to endanger the unity of their congregation when they took the names of these men for party labels. These were rifts (*σχίσματα*) which threatened to develop into heresies (*αιρέσεις*— 1 Cor. 1, 10; 11, 19).

The very purpose of the rich variety of gifts is to enhance the unity of the Church, serving as they do "for the perfecting of the saints for the work of the ministry for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

Such spiritual gifts have no independent existence. It is the Christ who first descended from heaven into the lower parts of the earth, who through His suffering and death purchased and won them for us; who now, having again ascended into heaven, dispenses them as the exalted Christ to His Church on earth. People who serve "dumb idols" in any shape or manner never receive such gifts. Their idols themselves being dumb, blind, etc., in one word, dead nothingnesses, naturally cannot confer such gifts which manifest a vigorous life, and serve to create and strengthen it in the Church.

In the foregoing we have already touched on the basic element in the unity of the Church. It is the unity of faith. Faith, nothing but the receptive attitude of the heart, which the Scriptures call faith, can unite us with Christ, the Head of the Church. Every attempt to reenforce or to supplement faith in Christ by any other factor will not merely be futile, it will disrupt the very unity which it is proposed to strengthen. The Judaizers of old tried to make their connection with Christ more secure by observing the various ceremonial ordinances of Moses as something essential for justification. Paul, after dealing with them

in Antioch and discussing the entire matter in Jerusalem, briefly sums up their theology in Gal. 5, 4: "whosoever of you are justified by the law," and states the effect of their "other gospel" thus: "Christ is become of no effect unto you; ye are fallen from grace." — The Roman Catholic Church supplements faith (not to mention now its distorted definition of faith) by insisting in its sacrament of Penance on a self-imposed contrition of the heart, on a carefully prepared minute confession of the mouth, and on an indefinite satisfaction of works, extending into purgatory. In this way Antichrist crowds Christ out of His rightful temple in the hearts of believers. — Reformed theology, although stressing the authority of the Scriptures, yet vitiates the purely receptive attitude of faith by insisting that God in His Word could not have revealed anything contrary to our reason, thereby making reason the final arbiter. — Synergism in its mildest form, by speaking of a different reaction of different sinners toward the Gospel, removes faith itself from the gifts of God which we receive; or by insisting that justification is not complete till the merits of Christ are embraced in faith, makes justification dependent, in part at least, on something in us.

We cannot stress the truth too much that the unity of the Church is by faith in Christ. It is a gift from God which we receive by faith. Faith is the *ὄργανον ληπτικόν*, no more, no less. All of God's covenants are one-sided. God takes all active obligations on Himself, and faithfully performs them. We are the beneficiaries, contributing nothing, but are always and in every respect on the receiving end. Thus we are united with Christ, the Head of the Church, by receiving His blessings in faith. By that same faith we are also united among ourselves with our brethren in the faith.

That Jesus wants us to have and enjoy the unity of the Church is evident from His highpriestly prayer. "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word: that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them; that they may be one,

even as we are one: I in them and thou in me; that they may be made perfect in one" (Jh. 17, 20-23).

Jesus compares the unity which He requests for us to the oneness existing between Himself and His Father. That is not merely a moral unity of understanding and will, an agreement in judging matters and determining the course of action to be followed: no, it is an essential oneness of mutual interpenetration. The Father and the Son are *ἐν*, they are one Being, *ὁμοούσιοι*. The oneness of the Father and the Son is unique. It is found only once in the world. It cannot be duplicated. The oneness which Jesus requests for the Church is not the equivalent of the oneness between Him and the Father, it is not an exact copy; but it is to be patterned after it. Thus the unity of the Church is not merely one of common interest, a community of opinion and striving. The members of the Church, as they are by their faith united with the Head, who is Christ, are by the same faith united with one another in Christ's mystical body, the Church. Just as Christ will say on Judgment Day to those on His right hand: "In as much as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me," and as He said to Paul when he persecuted the Christians: "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" — He is hurt or helped in His members — so this same truth applies with equal force to Christians in their relation one to another, as Paul expressed it in 1 Cor. 12: "Whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or whether one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it," not merely by reason of, nor in the manner of, common sympathy, but "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 been all made to drink into one Spirit."

The means by which Jesus wishes to see this oneness of the Church achieved is the same through which the uniting bond, appointed by Him, is effected, the bond which unites us with Christ our Head and with every other member of His spiritual body, *i. e.*, faith; and that means is the Word. In the text quoted above Jesus spoke about people who would through the

word of His disciples, whom He had called personally, come to faith in Him. About His immediate disciples He says: "I have given them thy word" (v. 14), adding the petition: "Sanctify them through thy truth, thy word is truth" (v. 17). The Word of God, the Gospel, being the power of God unto salvation, creates faith and through faith that oneness of the Church; the Word alone. Adulterate the Word: and at once faith is endangered, and the oneness begins to crumble. Only a return to the Word, and a faithful adherence to the Word, can heal the breach. Trying to establish the unity while at the same time neglecting the Word, cannot only produce no more than a sham union, in fact, it will cause the rupture to increase.

While preparing this paper a case came to my attention, from Germany, shedding a lurid light on this truth. In 1817 the Prussian Union was decreed. Did that produce a vigorous unity? The Word was subdued, *e. g.*, regarding the Lord's Supper. What was the effect of that "soft pedaling"? In the case under consideration the Lutherans were not sure any more of the real presence of the body and blood of our Lord in the Sacrament. Specious arguments, very much along the same lines as those followed by the Sacramentarians in Luther's day, undid their faith. That false Union of 1817 has emptied the very Sacraments which Jesus instituted for the purpose, among others, to be a bond of communion of their essence and their significance in the life of the Church.

Jesus in His highpriestly prayer emphasizes the Word as the means for producing, for strengthening, and preserving the oneness of believers.

Jesus mentions as the purpose which He hopes will be achieved through the unity of the Church "That the world may believe that thou hast sent me" (v. 21), and again: "That the world may know (*γινώσκη*, taste, realize) that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me" (v. 23). The unity itself is invisible, just as Christ is invisible, as faith is invisible, as the blessings are invisible, which we enjoy in the unity; yet even to the eyes of the world it becomes evident that there is some power at work in the Church which they cannot understand. It makes an impression on the world when they

observe that Christians "with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 15, 6). It must be an offense to them when they see the Church divided; but much greater will be the offense when they see Christians ready to ignore the differences that separate them and to compromise on matters which they pretend are most sacred to them. If we show indifference toward the truths of the Word, then by our very conduct we place hindrances in the way of the Word so that it cannot exercise its life-giving powers.

Jesus prays for a real unity of the Christians, one based on the Word of God, in order that in that way the world may be won for His kingdom. Since Jesus stressed the unity so strongly, even in His formal highpriestly prayer, we cannot easily overestimate its importance. And since Jesus links success in the one task which He assigned to His Church, namely bringing the world into His discipleship and under the saving influence of His Gospel, so closely to the unity of the Church, we who desire to bring people to faith in Jesus, will naturally make every effort to cultivate such unity. In this sense, our motto for our church work will be: "Unity first." And since this unity is inseparably linked to the Word — it is produced by the Word alone, it is impossible without the Word, it begins to crumble when the Word is violated or neglected — our motto of unity first is the same as: the Word alone, *sola Scriptura*. Any unity that is not achieved through the Word, and rests not securely on the Word, is not a source of strength but of weakness: it does not make for success in our work of saving the world, but for failure. It is only the truth that makes us free. Jesus came into the world to bear witness unto the truth. Only a man who is of the truth will obey His voice, and will be a blessed citizen of His kingdom.

When we are speaking of the unity of the Church, which, according to our Savior, is so important for effective mission work, as resting on the Word alone, we are not thinking of the Word primarily as defining doctrines, by a correct understanding of which the Church will become united in its religious views: we are thinking primarily of the Gospel as God's life-giving implement with which we work. Our task of bringing the Gospel of salvation to the world is not, above all, a matter of convincing

the intellect of men of a correct theory, it is a matter of injecting a new life principle into the hearts of men. It is a difficult task, which imposes a heavy burden on him who is called to perform it, and which rewards him with sufferings and with hatred from the very people whom in his love he is trying to help. For this cause we need constant strengthening and refreshment for our hearts, lest we grow weary. It is the prime purpose of the Word to provide such nourishment. When Jesus asked the Twelve: "Will ye also go away?" then Simon Peter answered: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life" (Jh. 6, 67. 68). This he said, not as the expression of some untried theory, it was the confidence which the words of Jesus had themselves aroused in his heart, it was the new life which the words of Jesus had created in him; *πεπιστεύκαμεν*, he says, *καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν*, *i. e.*, by Thy words we have attained an attitude of confidence, and we possess the knowledge of experience "that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God" (v. 69). In him the word of Jesus had proved its validity: "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life" (v. 63).

It is the same life which the Word of God creates in all Christians, not different forms of life. To be true, this life may occur in different stages of development, it may show different degrees of strength; it may at times be found at such a low ebb that it is hardly perceptible. It may vary in the same individual at different periods. The manifestations of this life are not the same in all individuals, nor are the gifts with which God adorns it. Yet essentially it is the same, consisting primarily in a faith in the free forgiveness of sins for Jesus' sake, in a love of God and of our fellow men.

This is the life which the Word creates and sustains in all alike; and thus the Word establishes the unity of the Church, one life pulsating through all its members.

We must note, however, that this is not a physical life, as we find it, *e. g.*, in plants; nor is it a mere animal life, as we find in the irrational beasts of the field, or in the fowls of the air, or in the fish of the sea, or even in man according to the natural side of his being.

It is a spiritual life, which, indeed, presupposes a personal being, but which by no means is identical with personality. In speaking of this life and of its seat the Scriptures frequently use the word "heart." "Create in me a clean heart" is the prayer of David. And the Lord promises through Ezekiel: "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you. And I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you" (ch. 36, 26f.). He even emphasizes that this will be a uniform life which He plans to create. "They shall be my people and I will be their God. And I will give them one heart and one way, that they may fear me forever, for the good of them and of their children after them" (Jer. 32, 39). And again: "And I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you. And I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them an heart of flesh" (Ez. 11, 19). This is the way the Scriptures speak of the new spiritual life: God adopts us as His people, creating a new heart in us, a heart which is the same (one) in all members of His people.

Although this new life presupposes personality, and is not possible without personality, *e. g.*, not in animals, yet it must not be confused with purely mental processes. On the other hand, we must also note that the heart is ordinarily reached only through the mental processes, particularly of thinking, of feeling, of striving; and in turn governs these processes. The Word of God in creating and sustaining the new spiritual life addresses itself to the natural functions of the soul. Thus the many points of doctrines, which by their great variety nourish our faith in various ways, address themselves immediately to our intellect, and through this channel convey their nourishing strength to the heart. It would be a mistake to consider doctrine exclusively, or even primarily, as a matter of the intellect. It is primarily a matter of the heart; but it reaches the heart by way of the understanding intellect. If doctrine had nothing to do with the heart, then we need not bother much about doctrine. Purity of doctrine would not mean much, nor would error. But since doctrine is only a means devised by God for nourishing the new life of our

heart, it becomes a matter of vital importance. We dare not ignore differences of doctrine: that would be a fatal mistake; we dare not agree to disagree: that would be suicidal.

How ignoring doctrinal differences will adversely affect the life of the Church was briefly pointed out above by a reference to conditions in the Prussian Union, particularly regarding the Lord's Supper. Similar results will follow in every case of compromise. The error, to which the privilege of tolerance, yes, equal right of existence with the truth is granted, will continue to exert its poisoning influence, while the truth, which can produce a vigorous God-pleasing life, will be toned down and eventually forgotten.

How can a Church which is neglecting, even poisoning, its own life carry out the task which our Lord has assigned to us?

Just as our Lord in His highpriestly prayer stressed the unity of the Church, and mentioned particularly the task for which He sent His believers into the world, so also in a similar vein do the apostles. We refer specifically to Eph. 4, where St. Paul summarizes the pertinent thoughts. He begins with a plea to cultivate the unity, presenting this as a part of our Christian conduct to match our Christian call: "I . . . beseech you that ye walk worthy (*ἀξίως*) of the vocation wherewith ye were called" (v. 1). Note that *ἀξίως* is placed in the emphatic position at the beginning of Paul's plea: their walk must be suited to their call, must match it, must balance it. This would be impossible if our walk showed any trace of pride or vainglory: "With all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering forbearing one another in love" (v. 2). In Phil. 2 Paul carries out the thought that our call to salvation rests on the humility of Christ, who took upon Himself the form of a servant and became obedient unto the death of the cross. In order to walk worthy of our calling we must let the same mind be in us. The aim of our meekness is: "Endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (v. 3). The unity, not an outward unity of organization or of outward association, but a spiritual unity of likemindedness, is thus presented as an invaluable treasure which we must, on the basis of our calling as Christians, endeavor to preserve if at all possible.

The Church is an entity, ἐν σῶμα, the same spirit of faith pervading all its members, the spirit created by the call of the Gospel, which kindled hope, the identical hope of salvation, in the hearts of despairing sinners: "There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling" (v. 4).

The calling is one and the same in every case, whether the called person be Jew or Greek, bond or free. The Savior of all is the same, not only in person but in His work of redemption. He did not prepare a different salvation for one group of people and another for another, perhaps a complete salvation for some, a salvation that must be supplemented by works for others. He is one. The faith by which Christ's merits are appropriated is the same in every case. There is not one faith which trusts in Christ completely, and another which relies to some extent on its own honor or its own merits; nor one faith which accepts every word of Christ, and another which treats some of his doctrines as open questions. And this faith is produced in every case in the same way. There is not a faith which in some cases is produced completely by the Holy Ghost, while in others it is the result of some form of cooperation between the Holy Ghost and the sinner, the sinner suppressing his resistance, holding it on the level of natural resistance, putting himself into a mood of passive receptivity. No, the faith which acclaim Jesus as his Lord and Savior is in every case the gift of the Holy Ghost. There is but one baptism of regeneration. "One Lord, one faith, one baptism" (v. 5).

The apostle has still more to say in summing up what all goes into the unity of the Spirit. He says there is "One God and Father of all." Paul is here certainly not speaking of the one God and Father of the rationalistic lodge which prates about the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. *Wir glauben all an einen Gott, Christ, Jude, Türk und Hottentot.* He speaks of the God who is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Of Him he says that He is "above all, and through all, and in you all" (v. 6). Above (ἐπί) all, as creator and master over His creatures. Shall we not be most careful how we try to serve Him? He is through all (διὰ πάντων), using us to carry out His designs. Shall we go devious, conflicting ways in our endeavors, knowing that it is the

same God and Father who is working through us? Shall we not religiously abide by His instructions? May we condone it when others deviate from them? Shall we join hands with them, and call it cooperation in externals? Impossible, since the apostle concludes with "in you all" (*ἐν πάνσιν*). The one God is living in us through His Spirit. "The life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me" (Gal. 2, 20). God is not divided.

Continuing his discussion, in the Ephesians passage, of the unity of the Church Paul mentions various gifts which are given to the Church by the exalted Christ, who through His deep ex-
 inanition led captivity captive, and in His exaltation now is giving gifts to men, such gifts as apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers. The purpose of these gifts is (*πρός*) "the perfecting of the saints," which will find expression in (*εἰς*) performing services (*ἔργον διακονίας*) resulting in (*εἰς*) the building up of the body of Christ, which is the Church. It is primarily a work on the individual members of the Church "till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge (*ἐπίγνωσις*) of the Son of God unto a perfect (*τέλειος*, complete, adult) man," as measured by "the stature (*ἡλικία*) of the fulness of Christ" (v. 13).

Children lack discretion and may easily be deceived. When we all grow into adult Christian manhood we should become immune to the lures of false doctrine, no matter with what "good words and fair speeches" men may present them. "That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive" (v. 14).

Again Paul points to the importance of distinguishing clearly, and of separating, between truth and error. The truth, every particle of it, has the nature of uniting with Christ, while error separates. Christ is the Head from which the body receives nourishment. How important then the unity! If any member holds to error, it will prove a "bottle neck" in the flow of the life stream from the head. Only if we all speak the truth in love will the body be able to make progress in spiritual growth. "But speaking the truth in love (we) may grow up into him in all

things, which is the head, even Christ: from whom the whole body, fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love" (v. 15. 16).

As in the Ephesians passage, which we just considered very briefly, so also in Rom. 12 and 1 Cor. 12 Paul uses the figure of a human body with its members to illustrate the unity of the Church, and the role which the various spiritual gifts play regarding it. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3, 28).

The unity of the Church is not a beautiful theory, it is a very practical thing. In the Third Article we confess that the Holy Spirit gathers all Christendom on earth. He is the one who creates Christians, and He does not create them as isolated individuals with an inborn tendency to keep aloof from others. He creates them as brothers and sisters, who do not have to be commanded to join together into a family; they are members by birth, and by their very nature are compelled to give expression to that fact. The New Testament in recording the beginnings of the Church gives us a multi-colored picture of the community of spirit as it was found among the first Christians. As soon as two or more persons in the same locality were won for Christ they found themselves not only united with Christ the Head through their faith, they found themselves united to one another by that same faith and its manifestations in word and deed. By the birth of two or more Christians in the same locality a local congregation was born. The several Christians did not wait for orders to found a local congregation. The Holy Ghost united them. We are too well familiar with the founding of numerous congregations as a result of Paul's missionary endeavors, that we need not now spend any time on reviewing some instances. We shall give our attention to something that more easily escapes our observation, and is often overlooked.

Just as God does not want individual Christians to keep aloof from fellow Christians in the neighborhood, but unites them in local congregations, so He does not want local congregations

to keep aloof from one another, but He unites them into natural groups. Neighboring congregations sought contact with each other, sharing with one another any special gift which God might have given to the one or the other of them.

A few cases. On his first mission journey Paul had founded congregations in four cities of southern Galatia. When a little later he revisited these churches, his attention was called to a promising young man, Timothy. Timothy had done creditable work for the two churches which were at Lystra and Iconium. He was "well reported of by the brethren" that were in these two places. Note the close contact which these two churches maintained, of which we here catch a glimpse. From Acts 16, 1, it appears that also Derbe should be included.

On his second mission journey Paul founded three congregations in Macedonia: in Philippi, in Thessalonica, and in Berea. They may have been separated by greater distances than were the churches of southern Galatia, but they also at once cultivated fellowship with one another. In his first epistle, which Paul sent to Thessalonica soon after he had left Macedonia, he gives them credit for practicing brotherly love "toward all the brethren which are in all Macedonia" (ch. 4, 10). They engaged in joint church work. There was at least one man who served all congregations of Macedonia, "whose praise is in the gospel throughout all the churches" (2 Cor. 8, 18). They had enough of an organization to carry out a joint election, in which this particular man was chosen as a traveling companion of Paul, to represent these churches in delivering the collection which they had gathered for the needy in Jerusalem (v. 19).

We find that Paul frequently groups congregations together according to their geographical location, not only naming them together but also treating them as larger units. The churches in Galatia had a common problem, when they were invaded by the Judaizers. Paul wrote one letter to these churches. They were in sufficiently close contact, so that a common letter was enough. When Paul arranged the collection for Jerusalem, he again treated the congregations of Galatia as a coherent group. 1 Cor. 16, 1: "I have given order to the churches of Galatia." — The congregations in Macedonia jointly elected a representative to deliver the

collection. They seem to have acted jointly in the whole matter. Writing to the Corinthians Paul says: "We do you to wit of the grace of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia" (2 Cor. 8, 1). — Similarly he takes the three groups of Christians in and near Corinth (Cenchrea and Athens) together. In Macedonia Paul boasted: "Achaia was ready a year ago" (2 Cor. 9, 2).

Peter does the same. His first epistle is addressed to the elect strangers "scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia" (ch. 1, 1). He addresses them as a group sufficiently connected with each other, so that one letter is enough. We add the observation that it was this scattered group which he addressed with these glorious collective nouns: "chosen generation, royal priesthood, holy nation, peculiar people." It is this scattered group which he reminds of their task "that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you." It is this scattered group which he calls *λαὸς θεοῦ*, although formerly they were "not a people" (ch. 2, 9, 10).

How did this lively intercourse between congregations, particularly between neighboring congregations, during the early history of the Church come about? Was it a purely human arrangement? Was it that God Himself had instituted by special command the close relation of Christians and their joint work in local congregations, while the Christians themselves and the inspired apostles Paul and Peter arranged the inter-congregational life as a matter of expediency? It is the Holy Ghost who gathers the Christians in the *Una Sancta*, and into larger and smaller groups on earth. When He creates Christians He creates them as social spiritual beings, as brothers and sisters, as members of God's family.

We see that St. Paul, under the direction of the Holy Ghost, diligently worked for the unity of the Church. We look at his efforts in this respect with the Church at Corinth. The unity of the Church was in special danger in this congregation both regarding the relation of the members one to another and of the whole congregation toward other congregations. There were *σχίσματα* in the Church when the names of Paul, Apollos, Cephas, and even Christ, were used as party labels (I, 1, 10ff.). These *σχίσματα* threatened to develop into *αἰρέσεις* (ch. 11, 18, 19). Paul urges them that they "all speak the same thing" and that they do not

permit "divisions" in their midst (ch. 1, 10). Only Christ was crucified for them, and He is not divided (v. 13). They were baptized in the name of Christ, and there is only this one baptism. Every member of the church at Corinth was grounded on Christ's sacrifice, and was received into communion with Him by baptism. This is what God had done to establish the unity of the congregation. Paul urges these facts.

What attitude did he take over against the spirit of aloofness toward other congregations? Did he say, it is sufficient if only the congregation is sound? Or did he recommend cultivating fellowship with other churches as a matter of expediency? He stresses the divinely created bonds which unite the Corinthians with the rest of the Church, which they must religiously regard in their conduct. He reminds them that some arrangements which he orders for Corinth are the same as he makes them in all congregations (see 1 Cor. 4, 17; 7, 17). He reminds them to conform to the "customs" (*συνήθεια*) of other churches: "We have no such customs, neither the churches of God" (ch. 11, 16). Therefore they must be very careful to avoid giving offense "to the Church of God" (ch. 10, 32). If they hide behind the independence of the local congregation he sharply rebukes them: "What? came the word of God out from you? or came it unto you only?" (ch. 14, 36). Already in the salutation he reminded them that they were sanctified in Christ Jesus, that they were called saints, receiving these blessings jointly (*σύν*) with all those that call upon the Lord Jesus, wherever they may be (ch. 1, 2). — When the congregations in Galatia, those in Macedonia, and those in Achaia act as units and are treated as units by Paul, this flows from the God-created unity of the Church.

When Paul organized the great collection among the Greek churches for the church in Jerusalem, his chief purpose was: thereby to cement two parts of the Church together which stood in danger of drifting apart. He frequently mentions Jews together with Greeks, saying that in the Church this difference does not obtain (Gal. 3, 28; Col. 3, 11). In arranging the collection he stressed that it should strengthen the *κοινωνία*; that it should demonstrate the *ἀπλότης*, the singleness of mind and purpose; that it should serve the *ισότης*, the practical exchange of bless-

ings, the abundance of the ones supplying the want of the others.

We have devoted considerable space to a review of the unity of the Church, although we are far from having exhausted the subject. Much more as to the nature of this unity will come up for discussion when we take up the matter of weak brethren, and of disruptions of the unity. Although our theme is the question of prayer fellowship, the matter of the unity of the Church demands more than a few passing remarks. Prayer fellowship, or joint prayer, no matter how much you may dilute the term, stands in close relation to the unity of the Church, either strengthening that unity as a heartfelt expression of it, or undermining it by simulating a unity which does not exist. Since prayer is a fruit of faith, affected in its nature by the nature of the faith from which it flows, joint prayer can be true only if based on a joint faith. If one of the worshipers approaches God and builds up his praise of God and his petitions on the sole merits of Christ, while the other, and if only in the slightest degree, injects the idea of his own honor and his own merits, a discord results that cannot be resolved. If one bases his prayer on the statements and promises of God, while the other, in theory or in practice, rejects even the least important or some seemingly unimportant truth of God, will such prayer sound harmonious in the ears of God? or will He hold the true worshiper guiltless because he joined his prayer to another with which together it creates a strident dissonance? Is a harmonious joint prayer possible where the unity of the Church is marred in theory or in practice?

A further study of the unity of the Church is required, and two specific questions present themselves for investigation.

(To be continued)

THE "NEW APPROACH" IN "LUTHERAN" TEACHING

We are living in the era of "new approaches" in Lutheran theology. We are constantly confronted with the expression, one which is rapidly approaching the status of a shibboleth in the mouth of those for whom following the "old paths" means intellectual and spiritual stagnation. "A changeless *Christ* for a

changing world" is still acceptable, but a "changeless *Word* in a changing world" is another matter, also in certain parts of the Lutheran churches of America.

We seem to have several "new approaches" with regard to the doctrine of *inspiration*. A "new approach" declares that only those parts of the Bible which are directly connected with Christ and the way of salvation are to be regarded as inspired, all the other parts being subject to human fallibility, with the Savior Himself a child of His age in all His comments on purely secular matters. This attitude is taken in spite of the specific statements of Holy Writ that "ALL Scripture is given by inspiration of God," 2 Tim. 3:16, and "WHATSOEVER things were written aforetime were written for OUR learning." Rom. 15:4. — A "new approach" declares that we must change our explanation of Bible texts, especially in the field of Christian ethics, to fit present-day social conditions; in other words, that we should discard all passages, or at least weaken their implications, that deal with worldliness and loose morals, since these are said to be irksome to members of liberal views. This viewpoint is held in spite of the fact that the real Author of Holy Writ is the eternal, infallible, and omniscient God, who knows the hearts and minds of men and has therefore included also such books as Proverbs and the Letter of James in the Sacred Volume and wants nothing added to, or taken away from, His Word. — A "new approach" attempts to invalidate the clarity or perspicuity of the Holy Scripture, chiefly by throwing the mantle of obscurity over passages that are as clear as the noon-day sun and have been quoted in catechisms for children these four centuries and more, among such passages being not only Rom. 16:17, 18, but even John 3:16!

A "new approach" which has been hailed with special acclaim is that of *lay participation* in doctrinal discussions, especially those which are intended to establish Lutheran unity. The proponents of the idea evidently flatter themselves that the superior business acumen of lay members will quickly find a way of cutting the Gordian knot of disunity. If that were, or is, actually the case, then it amounts to one of the severest condemnations of the Lutheran clergy everywhere. For all pastors and, for that matter, theological professors whose duty is to train future pastors and

keep them on the old paths, are supposed to be, as the God-appointed spiritual leaders of their membership, watchmen of the flock, able by sound doctrine both to exhort and convict the gainsayers, men who stand in the breach against all aberrations, not like dumb dogs, as the prophet describes those who are not faithful in this duty. Now all Christians indeed, and that means all laymen as well, are included in the category of those who are taught by God, John 6:45, and every one of them should be able to say: "Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." Ps. 119:105. But Holy Writ in numerous places indicates that those who have not been fully instructed in the various parts of Biblical teaching should not presume to take the leadership in doctrinal discussions, but are to show the humility of the Ethiopian eunuch, who frankly confessed that he needed guidance in understanding the Bible. Acts 8:31. The lay members of our congregations should indeed judge the teachings of their pastors, but only like the Bereans, who received the Word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily. Acts 17:11. The warning of the Lord in James 3:1 is plain: "My brethren, be not many masters," which, according to Luther's masterful translation, may be rendered: "Refrain from unauthorized teaching." This is fully supported by our Lord in Luke 10:16, by St. Paul in 1 Cor. 4:1; Gal. 1:8, 11, and elsewhere, in Hebr. 13:17, and in numerous other passages. We find "lay participation," properly understood, in the Apostolic Church as well as in the history of colloquies and doctrinal discussions of the Lutheran Church. It was so in the days of the Reformation, especially with regard to the Augsburg Confession. It was so, likewise, in the Lutheran circles of this country within the last century, from the Altenburg Debate down through the discussions between the United Synod South and other bodies, the Buffalo Colloquy, the Milwaukee Colloquy, and other meetings. If a layman had an actual Scriptural point to present, he was given the opportunity to do so, but never in a presumptuous manner. Undoubtedly there have been many Aquilas and Priscillas who could well instruct even a brilliant Apollos concerning some point of eternal truth. Instead of speaking of a "new approach," one might refer to a "renewed emphasis on a usage based on Scripture."

A third "new approach" is one closely allied to the new attitude toward the inspiration and inviolability of the Bible referred to above. It deals chiefly with the organization of congregations in corporate bodies and the franchise of Christian women in these congregations. It implies that the congregations of the first century were practically unorganized groups which were held together only by the authority of the apostles. But we are bound to consider a number of points. The very word *church* (*ekklesia* in the Greek) was taken into the language of the Bible from the designation given to the citizens' assembly, Acts 19: 32, 41, and we may well assume that the congregations recruited largely from the Gentiles were thoroughly familiar with the customs and usages of such assemblies, while those of Judea had grown up in synagogues, which had some very definite rules for organizational procedure. The early Christian congregations may not have employed the parliamentary machinery to which we are accustomed, but they had rules and regulations which were adopted in meetings and carried out under the supervision of officers elected by the congregations, as in Acts 6: 2-5; 15: 12, 22; 21: 22; also 1 Cor. 5: 4. The Lord of the Church, who did not draw up specific constitutions with rules and regulations for every Christian congregation, nevertheless expected all things to be done decently and in order, 1 Cor. 14: 40, and the results are seen in the history of church polity. Congregations as corporate bodies, recognized by law, were in existence as soon as the age of persecution was over, as we know from the case of litigation in Rome, when a Christian congregation was granted the permission to use a certain piece of property. — In this connection another "new approach" has been suggested, even at a large synodical meeting, namely the enfranchisement of women, particularly the unmarried, but also the married. That peculiar phenomenon, the inability to distinguish between the Church in the real sense, the *una sancta*, and the visible, corporate bodies known as congregations, seems to be causing the chief difficulty, causing even the exponents of Scriptural teaching to be somewhat diffident in upholding the position of the Lord of the Church. So far as the communion of saints is concerned, it is true: "There is neither male nor female," Gal. 3: 28. But so far as the corporate bodies known as congregations

are concerned, the Lord Himself has chosen to draw the line, in 1 Cor. 14: 34, 35 and 1 Tim. 2: 12. A Christian woman is to be in silence, to keep silence, not to usurp authority over the man. She may indeed, and should, take a very active interest in the work of the congregation, for the apostle says that the business of the church is to be discussed at home and the right information is to be furnished by the head of the house. This is the Lord's own regulation with regard to the enfranchisement of women now demanded in some quarters. That this restriction does not interfere with the work of women in the Church is evident from the roll of honor in Romans 16, from the example of Priscilla, Lydia, and other saints of the early Church, and from the long list of consecrated women throughout the history of Christianity. Not only in the work of the individual congregations, but particularly in the history of Christian schools and Sunday schools and in that of missions, Christian women occupy a very prominent place. We need no "new approach" here.

A final "new approach" to which we are constrained to call attention is in the field of doctrine, especially in the field of the presentation of teaching and that of agreement in doctrine. Voices are heard which clamor for the abolition of what they choose to call "Aristotelian logic" in the presentation of Christian truths, the inference being that the systematizing of doctrine in the science of dogmatics has interfered with the impact of Scriptural truth without the screen of such machinery. It may be that the period of the *Hochorthodoxie*, also known as that of Lutheran scholasticism, presented some developments which resembled those of the later Medieval Age. At the same time it should be noted, however, that Luther himself did not employ the devices of what we now call systematic theology, except in the propositions which he prepared for public disputations; and yet Luther presented the eternal truths with a clearness and vigor which left nothing to be desired by way of impressiveness and conviction. And we contend that the late monographs in the field, especially in America, have been constructed on the foundation of Biblical theology rather than on a rigid system. But in any event, the teaching of the Word of God requires the employment of the ordinary human rules of thinking, of logical deductions and conclusions. Without these

there can be no intelligent activity. The proponents of a "new approach" in this field, therefore, have no sound basis for their demand. — And, strange as it may seem, there are such as claim that unanimity of doctrine has been achieved in the Lutheran bodies of America, simply because all the bodies have now recognized the Lutheran Confessions. To this we are bound to reply that there may be a unity of faith in all Christian bodies of the world, but that does not mean that the agreement on confessions has produced an agreement in doctrine. It is a sound Scriptural demand which states: "The subscription to the Lutheran Confessions must always be implemented by the actual teaching and preaching of only sound doctrine, for the orthodox character of the church body is determined equally by its *official* confession and by the doctrine *actually taught in its midst*." A "new approach" which ignores this truth will defeat the entire objective of all efforts toward true Lutheran unity. "So long as false doctrine is publicly preached, taught, and defended in Lutheran synods, the fact that the name is alike and that they have officially signed or adopted the Lutheran Confessions cannot be made a justification for acts of fellowship." P. E. KREZTMANN.

Zum rechten Verständnis des 4. Artikels der Confessio Augustana
Korreferat, anlässlich der von der Missouri-Synode veranstalteten
dritten Theologentagung in Bad Boll, gehalten am 19. Juli 1948
von Pfarrer Friedrich Wilhelm Gopf, Mühlhausen b. Bamberg,
Deutschland *

In diesem Monat sind 80 Jahre vergangen, seitdem Anfang Juli 1868 zu Hannover die erste „allgemeine lutherische Konferenz“

Pfarrer Friedrich Gopf ist in der Juli-Nummer unserer „Quartalschrift“ (Seite 216ff.) zu Worte gekommen, wo er seinen Bekenntniskampf schildert, der zuletzt zu seiner Amtsentsetzung geführt hat. Auch in dieser Nummer unserer Zeitschrift lassen wir gerne diesen treuen Befenner, dem es in der Tat um Schrift und Bekenntnis zu tun ist, zu Worte kommen. Auf der dritten Tagung von Bad Boll I hat Pfarrer Gopf ein Referat mit obiger Überschrift gehalten, das zweifelsohne im Hinblick auf die Tagungen deutscher und amerikanischer Theologen in Bad Boll seine kirchenhistorische Bedeutung haben und behalten wird. Als solchen werden wir diesen Artikel und bringen ihn gerne zur Kenntnis unserer Leser.

Die Schriftleitung.

zusammentrat, um im Rahmen der damals gegebenen Möglichkeiten die evangelisch-lutherische Kirche Deutschlands in ihrer Gesamtheit nicht nur zu repräsentieren, sondern in einer Stunde tödlicher Bedrohung ihrer Existenz zum gemeinsamen Zeugnis aufzurufen und zusammenzuführen. Es war die bedeutame Tagung, auf der Theodor Kliefoth in seinem Vortrag über den 7. Artikel der *Confessio Augustana* jene These verfocht, die von der mehrtausendköpfigen Versammlung angenommen wurde und seitdem innerhalb des deutschen Luthertums als Zeichen der Sammlung und der Scheidung gelten muß: „Auch dem Kirchenregimente als einem wichtigen Gliede der Kirche gilt die Forderung, in der rechten Lehre und Sakramentsverwaltung übereinzustimmen mit der Kirche, die es regieren soll. Daher ist unzulässig, Kirchen durch ein gemeinsames Kirchenregiment ohne Übereinstimmung in der Lehre und Sakramentsverwaltung zu vereinigen“,¹⁾ — es waren diese Sätze das unüberhörbare Bekenntnis der lutherischen Kirche in ihrem Freiheitskampfe gegen die drohende Einverleibung „in den stolzen Bau einer deutsch-evangelischen Nationalkirche“.²⁾ Neben das unvergeßliche Zeugnis der Konferenz von der Kirche und vom bekenntnisgebundenen Kirchenregiment trat jedoch am 2. Verhandlungstag der Vortrag des Erlanger Professors Gerhard von Zeischwitz über „Die Rechtfertigung des Sünders vor Gott“ mit der programmatischen Einleitung: „Wo Lutheraner zusammentreten zu Rat und Tat, sollte das Bekenntnis zum Rechtfertigungsglauben der stetig erneuerte und erneuernde Ausgangspunkt ihrer Verhandlungen sein. Denn in Wahrheit, aus diesem Fels sind wir gehauen und der reformatorische Geist des Luthertums lebt nur fort, wo Luthers erschrockenes und durch Gottes Wort getröstetes Gewissen unter uns fortlebt. Hier springt im Lehrbegriff selbst der Lebensquell; und, wie unsere Väter zu sagen pflegten, mit diesem Artikel steht und fällt die Kirche. In ihm lassen Sie darum Herz und Gewissen uns aufs neue gründen und um das Bekenntnis dieses Artikels als um das Banner der Lauterkeit unserer lutherischen Einheit heut uns sammeln“.³⁾ Man könnte vielleicht darauf verzichten, diese Worte unserer Väter in Christo heute in die-

1) Tagungsbericht: Die allgemeine lutherische Konferenz in Hannover am 1. und 2. Juli 1868, S. 60f.

2) S. 60.

3) S. 74.

sem Kreise zu aktualisieren, weil sie unmittelbar zu uns reden. Ich möchte jedoch an sie erinnern, um von Anfang an zu bezeugen, daß auch unser heutiges theologisches Gespräch über den 4. Artikel der *Confessio Augustana* unlösbar verbunden ist mit der uns bedrängenden Frage nach der wahren Einheit der Kirche. Wenn die von uns immer wieder geforderten Entscheidungen hinsichtlich der Grenzen der Kirchengemeinschaft echte Glaubensentscheidungen sein sollen, muß dabei deutlich werden, daß es uns auch hier letztlich um den Artikel von der Rechtfertigung geht. Denn „wo dieser einige Artikel rein auf dem Plan bleibt, so bleibt die Christenheit auch rein und fein einträchtig und ohn alle Rotten; wo er aber nicht rein bleibt, da ist's nicht möglich, daß man einigem Irrtum oder Rottengeist wehren möge“. ⁴⁾ Warum? Weil es „der vornehmste Artikel der ganzen christlichen Lehre“ ist, „ohne welchen kein arm Gewissen einigen beständigen Trost haben oder den Reichtum der Gnade Christi erkennen mag“. ⁵⁾ Daraus folgt: alle Versuche zur Einigung oder auch nur Verbindung getrennter Kirchen sind höchstnötig, wenn dadurch der Artikel von der Rechtfertigung in seiner Klarheit, in seiner Schärfe und in der göttlichen Gewalt seines Trostes erkannt und bekannt wird als der Artikel, mit dem die Kirche steht und fällt. Denn dann dient die kirchliche Einigung dazu, daß die mit Christi Blut erkaufte Seelen vom Heiligen Geist durch das lautere Evangelium zu Christo berufen und bei Ihm erhalten werden im rechten einigen Glauben. — Umgekehrt: alle anderen kirchlichen Einigungsversuche, alle Bündnisse und Zusammenschlüsse getrennter Kirchen sind als seelenverderbliche Verführungen zu verwerfen und als teuflische Versuchungen zu bekämpfen, wenn dadurch irgendwie — daß ich so sage — die Alleinherrschaft des Artikels von der Rechtfertigung verdunkelt, in Frage gestellt oder geschwächt wird — etwa dadurch, daß man meint, neben diesen Artikel noch irgendwelche andere Prinzipien stellen zu können, die für das Leben der Kirche und ihre Einigung maßgebend sein sollen. Deshalb muß der Kampf der rechtgläubigen Kirche gegen den Unionismus geführt werden vom Artikel von der Rechtfertigung aus — als ein Kampf, bei dem es geht um die ewige Seligkeit der uns anvertrauten Seelen. Erst von hier

⁴⁾ Luther, Weimarer Ausgabe 31, I, 255, 5ff., zitiert Form. Conc., Sol. Decl. III, 6; (cf. L. Müller, Die symb. Bücher, S. 611).

⁵⁾ Form. Conc., Sol. Decl., a. a. O.

aus und nur von hier aus bekommt der Kampf gegen den Unionismus seinen wahrhaft tödlichen Ernst; nur von hier aus ist zu erklären und zu begründen, ob und warum in diesem Kampf die einen „stehen — und können nicht anders“, während die andern zunächst scheinbar ebenso stehen und schließlich können sie doch „auch anders“. „Die Seelen der noch Ungeborenen, die um ihrer Feigheit willen im Irrglauben und Unglauben verlorengehen werden, werden einst aus ihren Händen gefordert werden.“⁶⁾ So rief jetzt vor 14 Jahren jener unbestechliche Mahner, nachdem die deutschen lutherischen Landesbischöfe am 11. Juli 1933 die „Verfassung der Deutschen Evangelischen Kirche“ unterzeichnet und durch die Anerkennung dieser einigen Kirche, die einander widersprechende Bekenntnisse umfassen sollte, ihr Bekenntnis in flagranter Weise verletzt hatten, nachdem sie sich 1934 in Barmen erneut zu dieser bekenntniswidrigen Entscheidung bekannt hatten. „Wahrlich, sie alle werden einst im Jüngsten Gericht reden müssen, die in den Jahren 1933 oder 1934 aus Klugheit oder Torheit, aus Gutmütigkeit oder Feigheit geschwiegen haben, als es galt Zeugnis abzulegen für die lutherische Kirche! Sie haben sich nicht nur an der Kirche ihrer Väter versündigt. Sie haben sich an unserm Volk versündigt.“⁷⁾ Hier sehen wir den Zusammenhang: Der echte Protest gegen den Unionismus wurzelt letztlich im Artikel von der Rechtfertigung; es geht dabei um die Verantwortung für die einträchtige Verkündigung des lauterer Evangeliums, ohne welches niemand zum seligmachenden Glauben kommen kann. Denn es bleibt dabei: Der Artikel von der Rechtfertigung dienet „zu klarem richtigen Verstande der ganzen Heiligen Schrift vornehmlich“, weist auch allein den Weg „zu dem unaussprechlichen Schatz und dem rechten Erkenntnis Christi“ und tut allein „in die ganze Bibel die Tür auf“.⁸⁾ Deshalb bleibt der Artikel von der Rechtfertigung auch 1948 der gültige Maßstab für die Beurteilung aller kirchlichen Einigungsversuche. Denn entweder ist das lutherische Bekenntnis für uns die Urkunde einer ehrwürdigen Tradition, vielleicht auch das Panier einer theologisch-kirchlichen Gruppe, die neben andern Richtungen existieren kann innerhalb einer Kirche; dann wird der Artikel von

⁶⁾ Hermann Sasse, Was heißt lutherisch?, 1. Aufl. (1934), S. 16 — 2. Aufl. (1936), S. 25.

⁷⁾ Sasse, a. a. O.

⁸⁾ Apologie zu Conf. Aug., 4, 3 (Müller, S. 87).

der Rechtfertigung in seiner Exklusivität tatsächlich außer Kraft gesetzt; oder das lutherische Bekenntnis ist als *norma normata* nun tatsächlich das heute noch alleingültige Zeugnis vom Evangeliumsverständnis der rechtgläubigen Kirche, die in der schriftgemäßen Lehre einig ist und einig sein muß; dann ist Kampf geboten um dieses Artikels von der Rechtfertigung willen, d. h. um der Seelen Seligkeit willen unerbittlicher Kampf gegen den Unionismus in jeder Form, auch gegen den Unionismus in seiner allerneuesten Gestalt! Wir stehen vor der Frage, ob wir den jetzt geplanten Zusammenschluß der evangelischen Kirchen bejahen können oder ob wir ihn ablehnen und bekämpfen müssen. Was bedeutet der Artikel von der Rechtfertigung für diese Entscheidung? Wir haben zu prüfen: Dient der neue Zusammenschluß dazu, daß im Gesamtgebiet aller nun verbündeten Kirchen der Artikel von der Rechtfertigung nach dem lutherischen Bekenntnis allein maßgebend wird für die Verkündigung auf allen Kanzeln, für die Sakramentsverwaltung an allen Altären? Dient der Zusammenschluß diesem Zweck, dann, aber auch nur dann bestand Recht und Pflicht, ihn zu vollziehen! Wenn jedoch das Gegenteil festgestellt werden muß: wenn die allein maßgebende Bedeutung des Artikels von der Rechtfertigung durch den Zusammenschluß irgendwie in Frage gestellt, eingeschränkt oder verdunkelt wird dann ist uns der Kampf geboten, dann sind wir zum Widerstand gezwungen, dann dürfen wir auch vor der Konsequenz der Kirchentrennung nicht zurückschrecken!

Wir haben jetzt nicht diese Frage selbst zu beantworten, sondern von dem Artikel zu sprechen, den wir dabei als Maßstab anlegen müssen.

* * * *

Was ich Ihnen nun vorlege, ist lediglich ein sehr bescheidener Diskussionsbeitrag zur Einleitung des Gesprächs über CM 4, bei dem ich mich darauf beschränke, einige Gesichtspunkte hervorzuheben, die mir von der praktischen Amtsführung eines lutherischen Pfarrers aus beachtenswert erscheinen, und zwar will ich zunächst hinweisen auf drei Voraussetzungen zum rechten Verständnis von CM 4 und dann auf drei Hauptfragen, die in diesem Artikel von der rechtgläubigen Kirche beantwortet werden.

I. Drei Voraussetzungen zum rechten Verständnis von Confessio Augustana, Artikel 4

1. Als erste Voraussetzung zum rechten Verständnis von CA 4 ist zu beachten: Die Rechtfertigungslehre unseres Bekenntnisses hat ihre dogmatische Formulierung gefunden ausschließlich um der kirchlichen Verkündigung willen. Die Bekenner von Augsburg übergeben das Bekenntnis der evangelischen „Pfarrherren, Prediger und ihrer Lehren“ und bezeugen damit, „was und welchergestalt sie aus Grunde göttlicher Schrift in unsern Landen, Fürstentumen, Herrschaften, Städten und Gebieten predigen, lehren, halten und Unterrichten“ (Vorr. 8), — also Zusammenfassung der tatsächlich geschehenden Verkündigung ist unser Artikel ursprünglich, dann wird er festgehalten und wirkt als *norma normata* wiederum für die Predigt des Evangeliums! — Aus dieser einfachen Feststellung ergibt sich für uns die Frage, ob unser Interesse an der Rechtfertigungslehre ebenso ausschließlich bestimmt ist von der Verantwortung für die rechte Verkündigung des Evangeliums oder ob es uns dabei primär um ein theologisch-wissenschaftliches Anliegen geht, dessen Recht und Notwendigkeit an seinem Ort keineswegs in Frage gestellt werden soll. Mit andern Worten: Im Sinne unseres Bekenntnisses reden wir von der Rechtfertigung nur dann, wenn dabei deutlich wird, daß wir nicht eine Idee oder eine Theorie entwickeln, auch nicht ein theologiegeschichtliches oder geistesgeschichtliches Thema behandeln, ja nicht einmal nur eine exegetische Arbeit leisten, sondern daß wir von der Botschaft reden, die uns mit dem *evangelium aeternum* heute ebenso wie unsern Vätern anvertraut und aufgetragen ist. Nicht alle Beiträge zum Verständnis der reformatorischen Rechtfertigungslehre stehen in dieser Beziehung zur Verkündigung.

Einer der großen Lutheraner des 19. Jahrhunderts, die damals die Rechtfertigungsbotschaft neu entdeckten und auf deren Schultern wir stehen — August Wilmar — konnte deshalb mit großem Nachdruck betonen, es gehe bei diesem Artikel nicht primär und ausschließlich um eine Doktrin, sondern um eine Disziplin, es lasse sich davon „streng genommen gar nicht lehren, . . . sondern von der Rechtfertigung nur zeugen“. Er sagt: „Daß wir die ‚reine Lehre‘ haben, ist gut genug, aber . . . es gehört dazu auch ein reines Zeugnis. . . . Die bloße Lehre von der Rechtfertigung kann die Herzen

in gleicher Weise öde und kalt lassen, wie das „du kannst, denn du sollst“ der Rationalisten, und dazu hegt man denn wohl noch die fürchte Einbildung, mit seiner korrekten Lehre ein korrekter *propugnator fidei evangelicae* zu sein, womit man sich selbst und seine Gemeinde um die Seligkeit betrügt.“⁹⁾

Wir tun gut, dies Wort Wilmar's nicht alsbald durch die naheliegende Feststellung zu entkräftigen, daß der Begriff „Lehre“ in der *Augustana* ebenso wie bei Luther und im Neuen Testament ja dasselbe ausdrückt, was Wilmar hier „Zeugniß“ nennt, denn darüber mußte er ebensogut Bescheid. Wir wollen uns vielmehr seinen Hinweis zu einer notwendigen Selbstprüfungsfrage dienen lassen, von der wir nicht loskommen dürfen: Wie predigen wir heute die Rechtfertigungsbotschaft?

2. Aus der Verantwortung für die Verkündigung folgt die zweite Voraussetzung zum rechten Verständniß von CA 4: Die Rechtfertigungslehre unserer Kirche ist durchaus von einem seelsorgerlichen Anliegen beherrscht. „Daß sie den blöden und erschrockenen Gewissen sehr tröstlich und heilsam ist“, sagt bereits die *Augustana*.¹⁰⁾ In der Apologie durchleuchtet dies seelsorgerliche Anliegen in unvergleichlicher Weise die umfangreichen lehrhaften Ausführungen zur Verteidigung unseres 4. Artikels. Hierfür nur ein Beispiel: „Fromme Herzen aber sehen hie und merken, wie ganz überaus hochnötig diese Lehre vom Glauben ist; denn durch die allein lernet man Christum erkennen und seine Wohlthat, und durch die Lehre finden die Herzen und Gewissen allein rechte gewisse Ruhe und Trost. Denn soll ein christlich Kirche sein, soll ein Christenglaub sein, so muß je ein Predigt und Lehre darinnen sein, dadurch die Gewissen auf kein Wahn noch Sandgrund gebaut werden, sondern darauf sie sich gewiß verlassen und vertrauen mögen. Darum sind wahrlich die Widerfacher untreue Bischöfe, untreue Prediger und Doctores, haben bisher den Gewissen übel gerathen und rathen ihnen noch übel, daß sie solche Lehre führen, da sie die Leute lassen im Zweifel stecken, ungewiß schweben und hangen, ob sie Vergebung der Sünde erlangen oder nicht. Denn wie ist's möglich, daß diejenigen in Todesnöthen und letzten Zügen und Ängsten bestehen sollten, die diese

⁹⁾ A. F. C. Wilmar, Kirche und Welt, Gesammelte pastoraltheol. Aufsätze (1872), I, 87.

¹⁰⁾ Conf. Aug. 20, 15.

nöthige Lehre von Christo nicht gehöret haben oder nicht wissen, die da noch wanken und im Zweifel stehen, ob sie Vergebung der Sünde haben oder nicht? Item soll ein christliche Kirche sein, so muß je in der Kirchen das Evangelium Christi bleiben, nämlich diese göttliche Verheißung, daß uns ohne Verdienst Sünden vergeben werden um Christus willen. Das selbige heilige Evangelium drücken diejenigen gar unter, die von dem Glauben, davon wir reden, gar nichts lehren. Nu lehren noch schreiben die *Scholastici* nicht ein Wort, nicht ein Titel vom Glauben, welchs schrecklich ist zu hören. Denen folgen unsere Widersacher und verwerfen diese höchste Lehre vom Glauben und sind so verstockt und blind, daß sie nicht sehen, daß sie damit das ganze Evangelium, die göttliche Verheißung von der Vergebung der Sünde und den ganzen Christum unter die Füße treten“.¹¹⁾

Die seelsorgerliche Zuspitzung der lutherischen Rechtfertigungslehre nötigt uns dazu, den Menschen unserer Zeit nachzugehen und sie mit unserer Botschaft dort zu suchen, wo sie sich tatsächlich befinden. Dabei macht uns die Frage zu schaffen, warum wir zwar auf tausendfache Daseinsnöte unserer Zeitgenossen stoßen, aber höchst selten auf ein wirklich „erschrockenes Gewissen“. Schon Wilmar wies auf das „volle und ganze Sündenbewußtsein“ hin, ohne das die Rechtfertigung aus dem Glauben „gar nicht verstanden werden kann“, und stellte zu seiner Zeit fest: „das jetzige sog. Weltbewußtsein (die Weltkultur) besteht eben darin, die Sündenerkenntnis gänzlich zu beseitigen, besteht in einer Negierung der Sündenerkenntnis“.¹²⁾ Wir können deshalb das seelsorgerliche Anliegen der Rechtfertigungsbotschaft nur so weit wahren und zur Geltung bringen, wie es uns Gott der Heilige Geist gelingen läßt, durch konkrete Gesetzespredigt wirkliche Sündenerkenntnis zu wecken und die Gewissen so zu treffen, daß ihnen nach Trost hangen wird. Damit treten wir allerdings in den entschiedensten Widerspruch gegen alle heutzutage zeitgemäßen Programme und Parolen, einschließlich der vielfachen Versuche, das *Humanum* in seiner „Würde“ und „Schönheit“ auch auf sogenannte „christliche“ Weise anzuerkennen und zu pflegen.

¹¹⁾ Ap. zu CA 4, 118ff. (Müller, S. 108f.). Ein anderes an dieser Stelle vorgesehene Zitat (Ap. zu CA 4, deutscher Text; — Müller, S. 148, Abs. 5) wurde bereits im Hauptreferat von Prof. Paul Bretscher (St. Louis) mitgeteilt.

3. Noch eine dritte Voraussetzung zum rechten Verständnis von CA 4 ist zu nennen: Die lutherische Rechtfertigungsbotschaft ist ein Zeugnis der Glaubenserfahrung getaufter Christen, die zu fröhlicher Heilsgewißheit gekommen sind. Im 20. Artikel der *Confessio Augustana* wird — an der schon zitierten Stelle — gesagt, daß „diese Lehre (von der Rechtfertigung allein durch den Glauben!) bei unversuchten Leuten sehr verachtet wird“¹²⁾; dasselbe Urteil kehrt in der Apologie wieder, wo es von den Widersachern einmal heißt, sie seien „gute, rohe, faule, unerfahrene Theologen“ (*suaves theologi*, also: sanfte, liebenswürdige, Theologen)¹³⁾. Oder an einer andern Stelle: „müßige (*otiosi*) und unerfahrene Leute“, „sie wissen noch nicht recht, was Sünde für eine Last, was für eine große Qual sei Gottes Zorn fühlen“. Ihnen stehen gegenüber die andern: „fromme Herzen, die es im rechten Kampf mit dem Satan und rechten Ängsten des Gewissens erfahren haben“.¹⁴⁾ Hinter den Worten unseres 4. Artikels steht nicht nur Luthers Theologie, sondern seine Erfahrung, aber ebenso die Glaubenserfahrung Melancthons und ungezählter anderer, die durch Luthers Zeugnis zur Heilsgewißheit geführt worden waren, so daß Justus Jonas in der deutschen Übersetzung der Apologie einmal sagen kann: „Sie können wir uns berufen auf alle christlichen Gewissen und alle diejenigen, die Ansetzungen versucht haben“.¹⁵⁾ Um jegliches Mißverständnis auszuschließen, sei ausdrücklich betont: Die Wahrheit und Gültigkeit der rechten Lehre — also auch des Artikels von der Rechtfertigung! — steht und fällt selbstverständlich allein mit dem Schriftbeweis und keineswegs mit dem Maß der Erkenntnis oder dem Umfang der Glaubenserfahrung! Aber daß nun endlich der volle Trost des Evangeliums in der Heiligen Schrift entdeckt und in der Kraft des Heiligen Geistes für die ganze Christenheit verkündigt werden konnte, — dazu diente Luthers Glaubenserfahrung. Und wenn die Rechtfertigungsbotschaft heute als das *evangelium aeternum* gepredigt werden soll, und darf, so kann dies nur geschehen, wenn alle zu die-

12) A. F. C. Wilmar, Die Augsb. Conf. erklärt, ed. Piderit (1870), S. 70.

13) haec doctrina contemnitur ab imperitis; Conf. Aug. 20, 15.

14) Ap. zu CA 4, 131 (Müller, S. 110, 10).

15) In agone conscientiae et in acie experitur conscientia vanitatem illarum speculationum philosophicarum (Ap. zu CA 4, 37f. — Müller, S. 93); vergl. auch Ap. 4, 20 (Müller, S. 90).

16) Müller, S. 143, Abs. 2.

jem Botschafterdienst Berufenen — im Anschluß an Luthers Zeugnis — sich führen lassen zu derselben Glaubenserfahrung getaufter Christen, die zu fröhlicher Heilsgewißheit gelangen! ¹⁷⁾)

Hat die Erfahrung des Glaubens wirklich bei Luther eine derartige Bedeutung, daß wir sie als Voraussetzung zum rechten Verständnis des 4. Artikels der *Augustana* bezeichnen dürfen? Wir können das Thema „Glaube und Erfahrung bei Luther“ hier nicht behandeln. Für unseren Zweck mag es genügen, zwei Lutherworte anzuführen: In der Vorrede zur Auslegung des Magnificat (1521) steht der Satz: „Es mag niemand Gott noch Gottes Wort recht verstehen, er habts denn ohne Mittel von dem Heiligen Geist. Niemand kanns aber von dem Heiligen Geist haben, er erfahret es, versuchs und empfinds denn, und in derselben Erfahrung lehret der Heilige Geist, als in seiner eigenen Schule, außer welcher wird nichts gelehrt, denn nur Schein, Wort und Geschwäg“ (Weimarer Ausgabe 7, 546). In der Auslegung der Abschiedsreden Jesu (Joh. 14; 1538) lesen wir: „Daß andere klug sein und das Herzleid haben mit ihrer unzeitigen Grammatica und Rhetorica, so sie damit wollen die Schrift meistern und sie zerreißen oder je nichtig machen; es sind arme Grammatici, die da wollen aus ihrer Kunst von diesen hohen Sachen reden und urtheilen. Es gehören andere Leute dazu, denn diese Vocabulisten und Grammaticisten, nemlich die etlich mal sich mit der Sünd und Tod gerauft und gefressen, oder mit dem Teufel gebissen und gekämpft haben. Von diesen Sachen wollen wir niemand zu Richter haben, denn die versucht und erfahren haben, was dieser Artikel für Krafft habe“. Nur in diesem Sinn gehört die persönliche Glaubenserfahrung auch für uns zu den Voraussetzungen, von denen das rechte Verständnis des 4. Artikels der *Augustana* abhängig ist und bleibt und die ich abschließend noch einmal zusammenfasse: Wir können den Artikel von der Rechtfertigung nur dann als den Hauptartikel des lutherischen Bekenntnisses richtig verstehen und wahrhaft bezeugen, wenn wir dabei unsere Verantwortung für die von uns heute befohlene Verkündigung des Evangeliums bejahen, wenn uns deshalb das seelsorgerliche Anliegen der Väter beherrscht, und wenn Luthers Glaubenserfahrung für unsern persönlichen Weg zur Heilsgewißheit vorbildlich und maßgebend bleibt.

¹⁷⁾ Vgl. Kirche und Welt I, 87.

(Fortsetzung folgt.)

LUTHER PRAISED BY CATHOLICS

(Continued from last issue)

III.

Catholic Joseph Clayton tells us: "Luther's 'Address to Caesar and the Christian Nobility of the German Nation' was received as a trumpet call to war. The high emotional element that belongs to all great religious charges, for better, for worse, is a predominant element in Luther's character — combined with an invective of surpassing richness, assertion of recognizable grievances, and practical proposals for reform, made this tract or pamphlet highly exciting reading. . . . Luther's most masterly piece of polemical writing." *Luther*, pp. 74-76.

"The Babylonian Captivity of the Church" is the most radical writing of this most radical writer. Erasmus thought everything before this could be pardoned, but this was the unpardonable sin. The Swiss Glareanus sang its praise to Zwingli.

Rector Jöhn Bugenhagen at Treptow in Pomerania flung it to the ground in a towering rage: "No worse heretic has ever attacked the Church!"

He studied it. "The whole world is blind; Luther alone sees the truth!" He became pastor of the City Church at Wittenberg.

John Bugenhagen wrote Duke Albrecht of Prussia about "our dear father Dr. Martin Luther."

Franciscan Thomas Murner, D. D., Poet-laureate, scourged ignorance, greed, and lechery of the clergy, translated Luther's "Babylonian Captivity of the Church" anonymously, wrote 32 booklets against Luther. "The cleverest, wittiest, and coarsest" opponent said in 1520: "All Christendom, Martin Luther, would rejoice in you as a particularly learned man, if only you did not use your learning and clear reason to hurt the fatherland and destroy the faith and laws of the Fathers, and if you did not enjoy writing with a sword as much as anyone. For this cause we are obliged to defend ourselves against you as against a renegade enemy."

Caspar Ulenberg complained, Luther "wrote not with ink, but with human blood." Writing with a sword and with human blood — what a writer!

Catholic historian Jean Marie Vincent Audin writes: "Under the shadow of impending excommunication Luther asserts the sacred right of the individual, of the baptized believer, to acquire all truth and knowledge without external compulsion. . . . Faith is born through careful reading of the Bible. No one, neither pope nor bishop, has any right to dictate to the individual Christian what he shall or shall not believe." *Luther*, Vol. I, p. 79.

About the end of November Luther sent an amazing letter presenting "The Freedom of a Christian" to Pope Leo X.

Bugenhagen asked for a rule of life and Luther sent him the "Christian Liberty," adding: "A true Christian, led by the Spirit of faith needs no more rules of morals." He soon became Luther's faithful helper at Wittenberg. Kaiser Karl's confessor, the French Franciscan Jean Glapion, praised the work to Chancellor Gregory Brueck at Worms as "full of the greatest learning, art and spirit."

John Tewkesburg put it into English, and on December 20, 1531, he was burned "the stinking martyr," as the saintly Sir Thomas More called him. After 400 years it is still praised by the Jesuit Hartmann von Grisar.

For the glory of God and the welfare of souls the Vicar of Christ all over Europe for centuries had been burning heretics.

"To burn heretics is against the will of the Holy Ghost!" rang out Luther's clarion on a startled world.

What happened? The God on earth calls for help on the God of heaven.

The Catholic Audin rises to rapturous dithyrambics about Cardinal Pietro Accolti's "magnificent piece of Latinity, the magnificent document of our church, the work of art, impossible not to find in it the most complete disclosure of the classical regeneration of Rome at that period. . . . That glorious composition as a literary creation. Has Erasmus himself, who for long passed as the inheritor of all the treasures of the Roman language, ever diffused in his writings so much richness and harmony, given them so musical a cadence, and reflected antiquity so charmingly? . . . The exordium of the bull is itself a vast picture, in the style of Michael Angelo. Heaven opens, and God the Father rises in all his majesty: he inclines his ear to listen to the groans of his church, which cries to him to expel the fox that ravages the

sacred vine, — the boar that lays waste the Lord's forest. Then we see St. Peter, the chief of the apostles, attentive to the supplications of his cherished daughter, of that Church of Rome, — the mother of churches, — the mistress of the faith — the first stone of which he sprinkled with his blood. He rises full armed against these master-liars, whose tongue is a burning coal, — whose lips distil poison and death. You see St. Paul, who has heard the mourning of the faithful, and who comes to the defense of his work, tinged likewise with his blood, against a new Porphyry, whose tooth fastens upon the pontiffs deceased in the faith, as formerly did that of the old Porphyry on the saints of God. Then, at last, the whole firmament is displayed. You perceive the whole universal Church. On a luminous cloud the angels and thrones, the cherubim and powers, the prophets of the old law and the martyrs, the doctors and apostles, the disciples of Christ and the army of the blessed, who, with hands extended towards the throne of the Lamb, cry to the Lord to put an end to the triumph of heresy, and preserve peace and unity to the holy Church of Christ."

The wielder of that magnificent Latinity now comes hurtling from the celestial heights to drab, dusty earth and on June 15, 1520, the pope bulls the "wild swine" destroying the vineyard of the Lord out of the alone-saving Church.

Not content with the help from heaven, the God on earth turns to more earthly help. He calls on his sheriff, the 20-year-old Kaiser Karl V of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation and the lord of the New World America to do his duty — burn the heretic.

In the bloody Edict of Worms the boy-kaiser will ban the heretic and try to burn him. Still the Vicar of Christ is full of fear and calls on another powerful ally. He begs Erasmus, the Grand Monarch of the Pen Handlers, to defend the Church against the "wild swine."

Pirkheimer rated Erasmus the greatest scholar of Europe. Four hundred years later biographer Drummond and Henry C. Vedder of the Baptist Crozer Theological Seminary rate him the "greatest scholar of the world." This demigod on May 18, 1519, wrote the most magnificent Cardinal Wolsey, "I do not claim so

much authority as to pass judgment upon the writings of so important a person."

On the splendiferous Field of Cloth of Gold in July, 1520, King Henry VIII slapped Erasmus on the back and asked, "Why don't you defend that good man Luther?"

"Because I am not enough of a theologian."

To Pope Leo X, on September 13, 1520: "Luther wrote well on the Scriptures. It was above the mediocrity of my learning and talents" to write against him. Again: "It is much easier to conquer Luther with bells and with smoke than with arguments. . . . There are many things in Luther's books which are worthy of being known. . . . All who have written against him have composed nothing worth reading. . . . Among those who wish Luther dead I see no good man. The letters of Adrian of Utrecht are full of bitterness; he favors disciples worthy of himself, vain, deceitful, ambitious, and revengeful." A good chunk of food for thought for the elegant, corpulent Holy Father.

The God on earth calling on the God of heaven and all the saints, calling the powerful German Kaiser, calling on the prince of the pen, all against the one lone Luther! If history knows of another such fine and sincere compliment, this writer does not know.

On September 1, 1520, the staunch Catholic Jacob Wimpfeling begged Bishop Christoph von Utenheim of Basel and all German bishops and other great men together with the Swiss to urge Pope Leo to be mild and not let Luther perish, a man who has proved himself an evangelical Christian not only in his teaching, but also in his whole life.

Erasmus to Willibald Pirckheimer, Hutten's "First Citizen of Germany," in September, 1520: "I am extremely sorry such a spirit, who seemed to become an excellent instrument for proclaiming the evangelical truth, by the savage cry of certain people, should have been made so embittered."

To Rector Rosemond of Louvain, October 18, 1520: "From the taste of Luther's works which I have had I like his gifts, by which I conjectured he might have been a chosen vessel for Christ had he wished to use his gifts for Christ's glory. . . . By burning his books Luther may perhaps be removed out of the libraries, but

if thereby he can also be torn out of the hearts of men, I know not."

On November 1, to Albrecht of Mainz: "I think it is their fault if Luther has written too intemperately." This is worth remembering.

To Cardinal Campeggi on December 6: "I heard men of great merit, equally respectable for learning and piety, congratulate themselves for having been acquainted with those books (of Luther). I saw the more unblamable their behavior was, and the more approaching to evangelical purity, the less they were irritated against him. His moral character was recommended even by some who could not endure his doctrine. . . . To say the plain truth, the Christian world has been long weary of those teachers who insist too rigidly upon trifling inventions and human constitutions, and begins to thirst after the pure and living water drawn from the sources of the Evangelists and Apostles. For this undertaking Luther seemed to be fitted by nature and inflamed with an active zeal to prosecute it. Thus it is that I have favored Luther; I have favored the good which I saw, or imagined that I saw, in him. . . . Luther has received rare talents from nature, a genius wonderfully adapted to explain the obscurities of the Bible, making the light of the Gospel to flash forth. . . . The terrible bull of the Roman pope has appeared. . . . The matter could hardly have been carried out more hatefully. To all the bull appeared more ungracious than could be expected from the mildness of our Leo, and yet to this savage severity not a little has been added by those who had carried out the matter."

In the same strain to Duke George of Saxony, to Dean Richard Pace of St. Paul's in London, to William Lord Montjoy, and to others.

Archdeacon Manning, later Cardinal: "I am bound to say that on the one hand the just causes of complaint which made Luther first address the Bishops of Brandenburg and Merseberg (Merseburg) and his steady appeals through every gradation of ecclesiastical order to the award of a General Council and on the other the violent and corrupt administration of Leo X ending in an excommunication against a man whose cause was still unheard seem effectually to clear both him and those who for his sake were

driven from the unity of the church from the guilt of schism." — "The Unity of the Church," pp. 323-229. Lond. 1842; in Robert Montgomery's *Luther*, 3rd Ed., Lond. 1843.

Franz von Sickingen, "The First Knight of Germany," on September 1, 1510, renovated a cloister for seven Franciscan nuns. What for? "For the forgiveness of sins, meriting grace, salvation, and lessening of the pain" — in purgatory, for his highway robbery, and then kept on in his evil life.

Up in the strong Ebernburg the mighty knight and poet-laureate Ulrich von Hutten was poring over Luther's "Address to the German Nobility." A remarkable picture!

On June 4, 1520, Hutten wrote Luther a lyric tribute. ". . . They say you have been banned. How great, O Luther, how great are you if this is true. For then all pious will say of you: 'They sought the soul of the righteous, and they condemn the innocent blood.' . . . In all I have understood, I have always agreed with you. . . . In me you have a follower for every eventuality. . . . Koeln and Louvain have condemned you. They are the devilish gang that strive against the truth."

He sent Sickingen's invitation to come to the Ebernburg for safety. From Koeln Franz wrote Luther personally, "his mind was to cling to the Christian truth and to show furtherance and favor to Luther's cause."

Even the Spanish Dominican Francis Quinones, who was in Germany in 1520, favored Luther's doing "to a great extent" and by his writings was "pleased greatly and beyond measure," like "many learned people," because they hoped for the removal of the existing corruption from him.

Alphonsus de Castro and Laurence Surius, "pious and learned individuals," said if Luther erred, it was from excess of zeal, an opponent too hasty, perhaps, of an abuse lamented by Christendom.

The Elector Frederick the Wise sent Duerer some of Luther's writings, and he lettered Spalatin early in 1520: "I beg your Reverence give my due thanks to His Electoral Grace and in all humility beg His Electoral Grace to take good care of the laudable Doctor Martin Luther for the sake of the Christian truth, for which we care more than for all the riches and power of the

world; for all that passes away in time, truth alone remains to eternity. If God helps me to get to Martin Luther, I will diligently portray and engrave him in copper for a lasting memorial of that God-spirited man, who has helped me out of great terrors. And I beg your Reverence, if Dr. Martinus publishes something new in German, to send it to me for my money."

Jean Glapion, French Provincial of the Franciscans, whom Chievres made the Kaiser's confessor, in October, 1520, told Brueck at Worms Luther's writings "rejoiced him highly and beyond measure, for he had sensed a noble, new plant sprouting in Luther's heart, and not only sprouting, but also growing that it had branches showing useful fruits, which the church could have derived from them."

Then came the "Babylonian Captivity." How could he describe his terror? "He felt as if one had with a scourge scourged him from head to foot, though he didn't want to believe Brother Luther would acknowledge the book. If his, he could imagine Brother Luther was angered by the bull and wrote the book in hot rage. If he took back 35 heresies the damage could be repaired."

To the Elector: "Luther has the merit of being the first to demand strongly a reformation of the church, disgraced by many abuses, and thereby strengthened and heartened many timid people who from the bottom of their hearts wished for the same. He had opened the doors to much good. I mean well, for I myself wish nothing better than the reformation of the church. The Bible is soft wax that can be pulled into any shape. With the 'Babylonian Captivity' he began to roll a stone too heavy for him. He was not himself to destroy the good work he had begun. He did not praise Aleander's burning of Luther's book. Luther's Theses against the indulgences were to be praised, and there were not many scholars that did not agree with him. He thought the pope was wrong in saying the kaiser had no business with Luther's case. He told the kaiser God would punish him and all princes did they not cleanse the church from its enormous errors. God sent this Luther as a scourge for their sins."

Luther had almost brought the goods into port and should not spoil it by refusing to retract the "Captivity."

Ambrosius Catharinus was no match for Luther, he was writing into the air.

If he retracted the 33 heresies he would go unpunished and could devote himself to the beautiful work of reforming the church with real success. Kaiser Karl himself had been pleased with Luther's writings until the "Babylonian Captivity" appeared. He wished with all his heart so learned a man might be led back into the bosom of the Catholic Church. He likely wrote that in a rage, and he was to admit that. Since no article is so wrong but that it could be taken in a Catholic sense, Luther was to lend a hand for such an explanation. So said Glapion to Brueck.

To Sickingen and Hutten up in the Ebernburg: "Not even Luther's mortal enemies can deny Martin was the first to open for all Christians the right door to the secret of the right understanding of Holy Writ" . . . so Hutten wrote Erasmus.

At Koeln on November 5, 1520, Elector Frederick asked Erasmus, did he think Luther had till now erred in his teaching, sermons, and writings? "Luther sinned in two things: he touched the crown of the pope and the bellies of the monks."

Europe roared uproariously at the joke. But where is the joke? Luther touched the false doctrine of the pope and the corruption of the clerics.

WM. DALLMANN.

(Continued in next issue)

NEWS AND COMMENTS

Free Conferences. — The August 24, 1949, issue of the *Lutheran* reports on the action taken by the U. L. C. Executive Board on the request which their president, Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, received from Dr. J. W. Behnken to share in calling "free conferences . . . to establish existing agreement and to remove existing differences" in the interest of Lutheran unity.

"This month the U. L. C. Executive Board made clear that it doesn't believe there are basic differences in teachings among American Lutherans which should prevent Lutheran union.

"It re-stated the opinion of the 1944 U. L. C. convention that union is now possible 'on the basis of our common official subscription to the

historic confessions of the Lutheran Church (especially the unaltered Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism).'

"United Lutherans had said in 1944 that they would not set up any standards of true Lutheran teaching except those established in the days of the Reformation. 'We will impose no tests of Lutheranism' in addition to the historic confessions, and 'we will submit to no tests' other than these.

"The U. L. C. Executive Board advised Dr. Fry on August 11 not to become 'a member of the suggested national inter-Lutheran committee' to arrange the conferences."

The editor of the *Lutheran Standard* is undoubtedly correct when in the issue of September 17, 1949, he states: "To be sure, we must face the facts that here in America there is not too much enthusiasm for the free conferences which the leaders of the Missouri Synod are seeking to promote." Though he bases this judgment specifically on the fact that both the Augustana Lutheran Church and the United Lutheran Church have now officially declined President Behnken's invitation to share in calling free conferences, he himself lends further support to it when in the same News Jottings he heartily commends joint work of Lutheran bodies and closer federation for such joint work without having reached full agreement in doctrine and practice. He makes mention of such existing endeavors as Lutheran World Action, joint work among Lutheran students on non-Lutheran campuses, joint training of theological students, joint support of Negro mission work, joint Lutheran welfare work. We quote but one sentence: "Incidentally, had we followed the insistence of some Lutherans that we cannot have joint projects such as Lutheran World Action or student service unless we are fully agreed on all points of theology, these magnificent enterprises would not have been undertaken jointly — and what a sad loss to the work of the kingdom that would have been!"

C. J. LAWRENZ.

Bad Boll II. — In more ways than one the 1949 series of theological conferences at the South-German *Kurort* Bad Boll constitute a departure from the pattern set in the previous year. Some of the differences are of a formal nature, dealing with the manner in which the conferences of this year were organized. In 1948 Missouri was the sole host, all invitations being in its name. This year's conferences were arranged as a series of sessions of about ten days each, the first being under the auspices of the United Lutheran Church of Germany (VELKD), the second, of the National Lutheran Council of America, while the third and fourth were assigned to Missouri. Attendance was again by invitation, the intention being to secure a representative cross-section of German Protestantism. A sort of exchange system was likewise used, whereby a number of Missouri representatives appeared at the first two sessions, while at least one representative of the National Lutheran Council lectured

at the Missouri sessions. In the background of all loomed a benevolent U. S. Military Government, which had to a large extent assumed the costs of the conferences. Just why a government that is trying to teach the churches of Germany the American Way, and why churches that like to point with pride to the blessings of a separation of Church and State, should enter into such a pact with one another is difficult to understand, — unless indeed the overseas representatives of both State and the churches are gradually becoming victims of their environment.

More important, perhaps, were the differences that appeared in the way in which the individual sessions were conducted, as well as in the positive testimony that was given. In earlier issues we have expressed our concern over the situation that was created when in 1948 Missouri in its position as host shared the leadership in the daily devotions with its guests in spite of the fact that the premises for religious fellowship were admittedly still lacking, and included in its program a service at which the Bishop of the Union Church of Baden presided. To the credit of the Missouri representatives it must be said, however, that this time strong testimony was given to the effect that full agreement in doctrine and practice are the indispensable prerequisites for pulpit and altar fellowship. In other respects also there was a far stronger emphasis by the representatives of Missouri on the differences that stand in the way of full fellowship than was the case a year ago.

Whether this change of emphasis will be enough to remove the offense that was created by the incidents of Bad Boll I, whether the harm that was done to the Free Churches of Germany by that apparent disavowal of the position which they have held for generations for conscience' sake, whether all this has been adequately repaired by this silent correction of the previous error, only time can tell. But reports appearing in current issues of the religious periodicals seem to indicate that these writers still cling to the hope that they are facing a new Missouri, a different Missouri from the one they had come to identify with the old Free Church of Saxony.

This appears, for instance, in an article by Hagen Katterfeld (in *Nachrichten für die ev.-luth. Geistlichen in Bayern*), whose views are particularly important because he is the personal aide of Bishop Meiser. This article expresses pained surprise at Missouri's refusal of pulpit and altar fellowship, which apparently had been expected on the basis of impressions made on Missouri at the 1948 conference. With an obvious effort at tolerant understanding it speaks of having endured this "spiritual fasting" without charging Missouri with being people who are resisting the Spirit of God who calls for unity, and without declaring them reactionaries bent only on restoring a former theology. But it holds nevertheless that freedom in these matters is the characteristic of Lutheranism over against the legalism of the Calvinistic position, and declares itself confirmed in this view by their "narrow" brethren from Missouri.

Obviously Bishop Meiser still claims the endorsement of Missouri for having carried his Bavarian *Landeskirche* into the union of the *Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland*, EKID. In the meantime the contrary position of the Free Churches is under a cloud, where Missouri's approval will continue to be quoted against them. And this at a time when Dr. Hans Asmussen, one of the participants at Eisenach, is declaring that the formation of EKID on that occasion was premature, that the efforts at preserving Lutheranism via a VELKD within the EKID are futile, and that the way to a true unity must avoid the byways of ecclesiastical power politics.

Apparently Missouri is not yet out of the woods.

E. REIM.

Dr. Bodensieck's Appraisal of Bad Boll II. — The German edition of the *News Bulletin* (Vol. III, No. 7, July 15, 1949), official organ of the Lutheran World Federation office of Dr. S. C. Michelfelder, Executive Secretary, Geneva, which was sent to us by one of our German informants, contains Dr. Bodensieck's appraisal of the sessions held at Bad Boll from June 1 to July 13. According to this *News Bulletin* the former President of Wartburg Seminary emphasizes the importance of the participation of the National Lutheran Council as partner of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Germany and of the Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod, having equal rights and the same responsibilities. As a result of this participation on the part of the National Lutheran Council the American Lutherans had a full representation and not only a one-third representation, as at Bad Boll I. Dr. Bodensieck also stresses the participation of the American Military Government as a fourth partner, a proof that the military realizes the need of a religious and churchly basis for the reconstruction of Germany.

The third point of Dr. Bodensieck's appraisal is the agreement between the German and the American theologians in all fundamental questions, which "stood out in an overwhelming manner." Only questions on the periphery are still open. In all essential matters there is full agreement. Finally Dr. Bodensieck pointed out that the representatives of the Missouri Synod are not willed to pass these questions by which are agitating European theologians. They have made it quite plain, Dr. Bodensieck adds, that they intend to participate in the extensive research work which is being undertaken in Europe. Bad Boll also gave American theologians an opportunity to carry on discussions with one another and among themselves. They were of great importance and were instrumental in clearing up many a matter.

Dr. Bodensieck brought his remarks to a close with the statement that Bad Boll II was a first attempt on the part of these four partners and that there is room for much improvement. The need of improve-

ment is evident to all according to Dr. Bodensieck, especially to the committee of the National Lutheran Council. But whatever the need of improvement may be, the further development of this institution is safeguarded and represents one real step forward.

Because of the importance of these statements by Wartburg's former president, in which he evaluates the doctrinal differences and also Missouri's cooperation, a reprint of the text of the *Deutsche Ausgabe* is herewith being offered to our readers.

Zu der Tagung in Bad Boll vom 1. Juni bis 13. Juli 1949.

Professor Dr. Julius Bodensieck wurde von uns über die wesentliche Bedeutung dieser Tagungen befragt. Er hat uns auf folgende Punkte hingewiesen:

1. Es sei wichtig gewesen, daß neben dem deutschen Luthertum vieler Schattierungen und der Missouri-Synode diesmal das amerikanische lutherische Nationalkomitee als gleichberechtigter und mitverantwortlicher Partner mitwirkte. Auf diese Weise waren die Lutheraner Amerikas nicht nur durch ein Drittel, sondern voll vertreten.
2. Ebenso bedeutsam war die Beteiligung der amerikanischen Militärregierung als vierter Partner. Damit ist bewiesen, daß die Militärregierung erkennt: der Wiederaufbau Deutschlands ist nur auf religiösen und kirchlichen Grundlagen möglich.
3. Die Übereinstimmung zwischen deutschen und amerikanischen Theologen in allen wichtigen Grundfragen trat überwältigend hervor. Nur Fragen der Peripherie sind noch offen. In allem Wesentlichen aber herrscht Einigkeit.
4. Die Teilnehmer der Missouri-Synode zeigten deutlich, daß sie an den Fragen, die die europäische Theologie heute bewegt, nicht vorbeigehen wollen. Sie bewiesen den Willen, an der großen Forschungsarbeit, die hier getan wird, mitzuwirken.
5. Die Mitglieder der Missouri-Synode sind auch mit den anderen amerikanischen Teilnehmern in Bad Boll ins Gespräch gekommen. Es brachte manche Klärung und war von großer Bedeutung.

Die Tagung war ein ernster Versuch; noch manche Verbesserungen sind notwendig, namentlich auf Seiten des amerikanisch-lutherischen Nationalkomitees. Aber die Verbesserungsnotwendigkeiten und -Möglichkeiten sind allen Anwesenden klar geworden. Die Weiterentwicklung der Institution als solcher ist gesichert. Die Tagung in Bad Boll bedeutet einen großen Schritt vorwärts.

N. B., L. W. F., Genf.

In addition to this appraisal a number of American theologians who lectured at Bad Boll have given us their impressions of this meeting, which we herewith also bring to the attention of our readers.

P. PETERS.

American Theologians' Impressions of Bad Boll. — What impressions did American theologians bring home from the second international meeting of Lutheran theologians at Bad Boll from June 1 to July 13? Were they favorable or unfavorable? They were both, although the favorable impressions by far outweigh the unfavorable.

American theologians were favorably impressed by the learning of Germany's outstanding scholars. Dr. Theodore Graebner in his article on "The Free Conferences at Bad Boll 1949" in the *Lutheran Witness* of September 6 writes: "There were more than four hundred theologians from all zones, including the Russian, most of them pastors in charge of congregations, present at Bad Boll during the six weeks of sessions, and what impressed us deeply, whether during the convocations or during the smaller group meetings, was the acquaintance of the average German Lutheran pastor with the confessional writings of his Church and with the position of Martin Luther on matters of Christian faith. When to this we add the observation that Lutheran *scholarship* is holding its own, in spite of the handicaps which Nazism imposed on theological study and the destruction of churches, parsonages, and religious libraries, the reader will have something of a picture of our impressions of Bad Boll 1949." Professor Herman Preuss in the *Lutheran Herald* of August 30 has this to say in a series of articles on "American Theologian in Germany": "The number of scholars and theologians among the regular clergy here is amazing. It reveals a solidity of educational background that gives them a great advantage in discussing theology. They know their Biblical languages and the Latin of the Church fathers. Their knowledge of the Bible and the Confessions is superior to ours."

But American theologians were not only impressed by the learning of the German theologians. What is more, they were impressed by the life of the Church as they had opportunity to see it. Dr. Graebner writes in his article: "For one thing we have all been impressed with the fact — this is a *repentant Church*, . . . And the second impression was that of a Church seeking a *return to the faith of the fathers and to the theology of Luther*." Professor Preuss in turn was also strongly impressed by "the kind of faith that only suffering can produce" and therefore adds: "Here is one of the most inspiring and also humbling experiences one meets at Bad Boll. Whether it be in conversation or in their devotional meditations, there is an intensity in their faith, in their love of Christ, and in their devotion to their ministry that kindles a fire in your heart when you hear them. I think of what a leaven that sort of a faith must be in the Church of Germany."

But even more important than this is the impression which American theologians brought back home of the "great agreement" which "marked the papers and also the contributions from the floor. The value of the Lutheran Confessions was set forth as powerfully as anywhere in our own Synod's literature," Dr. Graebner tells us. "To hear such men," he adds,

having listed the names of some of the lecturers, "speak out of their fullness of experience and learning what we have recognized and accepted for a hundred years as the soundly Biblical position is indeed an experience unforgettable." Professor Preuss also is surprised at the "sound Lutheran theology" of the German theologians, professors from the universities, theological seminaries, and church administration offices, and then says further: "There has not been the amount of conflict we had anticipated. There has been quite consistently a strong emphasis on the absolute authority of the Scripture and the centrality of the Gospel of the crucified and risen Christ. The importance of the Confessions in the Church's struggle with the State has been a revelation to us and has given us a new reverence for them." And Dr. J. T. Mueller in *Der Lutheraner* of August 30 speaks of "the great agreement in doctrines" which became apparent at Bad Boll, and that it is not exaggerating things to emphasize this agreement.

Men who have been thus favorably impressed by the German theologians, their learning, their life of faith, and their loyalty to the Confessions will undoubtedly tell us what unfavorable impressions they received. In speaking of unfavorable impressions — the expression as such is not used by any of the writers — Dr. Mueller does not want us to overlook the fact that only such German theologians were present who are known for their positive stand and who are in opposition to liberalism. In other words, the impression gained by American theologians may not be generalized and applied to all of Germany's theologians. The liberal theology of Germany, for instance that of Bultmann in Marburg referred to by Dr. Mueller, was not at all represented. Nevertheless, the agreement with the positive theologians was not complete, as Dr. Mueller also tells us. In the end all three writers whom we have quoted till now speak of disagreements. Dr. Graebner puts it this way: "It is not surprising that on such a variety of subjects (as for instance Parents, the State, the Church, and the Child; Revelation and Scripture; the Confessions; Original Sin and Original Guilt; Atonement and Justification; Church and Churches; the Sacraments a. o.) differences of conviction came to the surface." Dr. Mueller abets the aforesaid by mentioning particulars, namely that some of the positive theologians "could for instance not agree on the doctrines of the Inspiration of the Scriptures and of Communion-fellowship, as these are being defended by us on the basis of the Word of God." Professor Preuss in his articles is more outspoken on this matter. His way of putting it is quite telling: "As the weeks pass and we meet more of them, (theologians) we are of course learning not to be overly optimistic. We are aware that the Germans know they are guests of our American Churches and Military Government. Hence they are pretty apt to avoid open conflict by exploding any views that might be too radical. Once in a while it does break out, as it did yesterday on the story of Adam and Eve in the Garden. Is it history or

not? We have heard the same old heresy for years, and it pops up in different forms at different times. Other differences appeared in the matter of the Inspiration of Scripture, as we had expected. But even here there was more agreement than we had expected."

Having heard what impression the German theologians made on the American theologians, we would also like to hear what impression the American theologians made on the German theologians.. To have the American theologians who were present at Bad Boll tell us this is really asking too much of them. We will have to wait for German theologians to answer our question. But Professor Preuss does do us the favor to give us a tentative answer: "I believe the American Lutheran theology they are hearing is making something of an impression on the Germans — how much is hard to say. German theology for the last 150 years has gotten quite a ways away from Luther and the Confessions and their understanding of the Bible. While there has been a comforting swing back, nevertheless there is, of course, a certain amount of the modernistic theology which still hangs on among the pastors and professors. Our first impression was a happy one at finding them so close to us — much closer than we had expected." But then Professor Preuss goes on to say: "As the weeks pass and we meet more of them, we are of course learning not to be overly optimistic," words that we have already quoted in another connection.

There is no doubt in our minds that the impressions gained by the three writers whom we have quoted are the impressions of all American theologians who were at Bad Boll. This writer was similarly impressed by the learning, life of faith, and confessional leanings of the German scholars lecturing at the Eighth Session of the Luther Academy at Sondershausen (Cf. *Quartalschrift*, 1940, p. 97). This was before the war. Since then German theologians, some of whom were also present at Sondershausen in 1939, have lived through years of tribulation and trials with which the German nation and church were visited. Can we expect anything else but that the Christians in Germany, clergy and laymen alike, are turning to the Scriptures and to their Lutheran Confessions more than ever before, that their faith in the Word has been quickened throughout the fiery trials of the past ten years! We cannot. We gladly quote *Der Lutheraner, Zeitblatt für Evangelisch-Lutherische Gemeinden in Deutschland*, which gives us some information in its July number concerning the confessional stand of Germany's theologians. Thus Dr. Hans Asmussen, former president of the Chancery of the EKID, declared at the Ninety-sixth Lutheran Conference in Flensburg that "the Holy Scripture is God's inerrant Word." And Dr. Erich Stange writes in his *Pastoralblätter* in retrospect of Bad Boll I, whether it is not time to give serious thought to the doctrine of Verbal Inspiration, since it can not be replaced by any other. Again, the Alsatian theologian Dr. Suess, who is a member of the Ev.-Luth. Faculty in Paris, carried out in an essay

that "as the person of Jesus Christ is without any diminution the Christ, thus also the whole Bible, even where it has no form and comeliness, is the Word of God. Consequently I cannot understand," Dr. Suess exclaims, "how one could get the thought, to deny Verbal Inspiration." Certainly, these are signs which impress one favorably, although we gladly heed the warning of *Der Lutheraner* that "they are not already to be evaluated as beginnings of a fundamental change."

But was it at all the purpose of Bad Boll II to impress and to be impressed. Impressions are at their best something subjective. They are something personal. They do not answer the question as to the objective results of Bad Boll II, or I for that matter. What is, we ask, the actual confessional stand of the Lutheran theologians in Germany? And what is more, we desire to know the confessional stand of the church which they represent. But which church do they represent? The United Evangelical Lutheran Church in Germany or the Evangelical Church in Germany, or both? German theologians declared at Bad Boll, Dr. Mueller informs us, that the EKID is but a confederacy. But is it only that and did it suffice on the part of the American theologians to only warn the German pastors and professors "to heed the dangers of such a confederacy," and to admonish the Kirchenvolk "not to forget its duty to confess?" And were the American theologians agreed on the question whether the EKID is a confederacy or a church? If not, what did they do "that this point will gradually be fully clarified?" to quote Dr. Arndt in the *Concordia Theological Monthly* of August, 1949. The *Quartalschrift* has answered this question more than once in its past issues. But what are they doing to answer this question who are meeting with the German theologians year after year? These and other questions we ask and shall ask in view of Bad Boll I and II, questions that cannot be answered by impressions made and impressions received, however lasting and deepening these impressions may be for the participants, but can only be answered by the Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions.

P. PETERS.

Dibelius' Pastoral Letter. — The Whitsunday message of Bishop Otto Dibelius of Berlin read from all pulpits under his jurisdiction in the Berlin-Brandenburg area has drawn the attention of Christians throughout the world to the church situation in the Soviet zone. We regret that we were not able for lack of space to publish this letter in the July issue of our Quarterly. Since it pictures conditions in the Russian zone as they obtain today, we do not hesitate to present this message to our readers even at this late date. Its wording as published in the *Lutheran Herald*, June 28, is as follows:

"In the four years that have just passed, the church leaders have withheld criticism. The reason for this was that until now our public life was

under complete domination and responsibility of the occupation forces. After all, since others endured for six years war from Germany, the church did not have the internal freedom to make charges outside. In a quiet way, we have done what we could for those who had lost their rights, for the prisoners, and for the internees. . . .

"From now on the responsibility for what happens in Germany will fall more and more on German shoulders. A German government is in the making. With this, the hour has come to speak where I kept silence before. . . .

"At the present time, we are burdened above all by the worry that the government that is forming shows the tendencies which awoke resistance in Nationalist Socialist days. . . .

"In the so-called People's Police, we see the resurrection of the Gestapo. They operate with the same methods as they did there. This gathering of material through spying and denunciation; the arrests by night; the third degree methods beyond description; the hearings in which the prosecuted person has no chance to defend himself; the uncertainty of the length of imprisonment and of what is to happen to relatives — we are well acquainted with this. . . .

"The new People's judges are instructed to act because of political rights which really signify nothing else than that political force is substituted for right. . . .

"Were the ballots for the election of the 'Volkskongress' not made exactly according to the pattern of the National Socialists? There was a question printed in bold type which was difficult to answer except in one way: 'Yes.' With this affirmative answer, however, the voter really gave assent to a predetermined list of representatives. All Burgermeisters were instructed to consider all ballots which were not valid as 'Yes' answers. This proves that the whole election was based on internal dishonesty. . . .

"The leaders of the Evangelical Church testify often and willingly that the Church has found understanding and good will for some of its requests. However, it is true that in many villages and towns the life meets all kinds of restraints through measures taken by the political authorities.

"We mention only these two examples: . . . inhabitants are commanded to work on Sundays . . . (and) religious instruction in the schools continually meets difficulties . . . so that children grow up without any religious instruction (but) at school under anti-Christian influence. . . .

"We ask everyone in whose breast a conscience is awake not to yield himself to anything that breathes the spirit of violence and dishonesty. A courageous 'No' to that which is against the commandment of God makes one free, even if the consequence brings danger and distress. . . ."

Were this letter but a criticism of political machinations on the part of the Communist authorities, we would not grant it any space in our Quarterly. Since it is more, since it is a protest against more or less hidden attacks on the church, we cannot simply pass it by. Bishop

Dibelius mentions two measures of the political authorities whereby church life is being restrained: The inhabitants are commanded to work on Sundays and religious instruction in the schools continually meets difficulties. History is repeating itself in Germany within a short span of time and Bishop Dibelius does not have to extend himself in comparing the conditions as they obtain today with those that flourished under the regime of National Socialism. Of course, the Evangelical Church is constantly exposing herself by carrying on religious instruction in the State schools. It is an easy matter for a government that is hostile to the Christian religion to squeeze religious instruction out of the usual time allotment and so to arrange the secular subjects that there is no longer time for religious instruction. In Mecklenburg the State Board of Education even "issued," according to the August number of *The Lutheran*, "a restricted circular stating that no teacher will be permitted to teach doctrines of the church which are in contrast to the materialistic doctrines propagated by the state and the Communist Party (SED). The circular refers to the biblical teaching of the creation of the earth and of man, which would conflict with Marxian doctrine." The Communists have published a history book, *Geschichte des Altertums*, by Mischulin, which is "used as a text book for instruction. Here the assertion is made that Christ never lived." *The Lutheran* further reports "that church kindergartens and homes for children are closed under one pretext or other. In this indirect fashion the work of the church is hampered without any open attack." Again we read in the same number of *The Lutheran* that a bill is "pending in the Brandenburg legislature limiting church activities to church buildings." These reports tally with the statement made by Pastor Niemoeller on his lecture tour in Australia that the Russians are banning "open air religious services and gatherings," that this ban is "in line with the Soviet policy of confining religious expression to the smallest possible area and keeping religion out of public life." *The Lutheran Witness* of August 9 has this to add: "In Thuringia four million copies of Communist periodicals are distributed every day, but only 25,000 church papers are permitted a month. The goal is the atheistic school." Communism, which wants to have sole influence on a nation and its public life, ruthlessly restricts the influence of the church as much as possible.

Can the church flourish when thus restricted? According to all reports from the Soviet zone such is the case. Pastor Niemoeller reports after having recently visited the Soviet occupation zone of Germany for five weeks that the churches there were "in a flourishing condition." *The Lutheran* speaks of "fine reports from church leaders in the Soviet zone about their success in recruiting 15,000 teachers for their newly organized program of Christian instruction" and of information that "the church still means a refuge and support to people in distress, a sign of truth and justice to be seen far" (p. 19). *The Lutheran Witness* in its article also

speaks of "a new office, that of catechists," that has been created by the churches and of the training which these newly recruited teachers receive from their pastors.

Persecution does not spell destruction for the Church. While we do not doubt that "the country is slowly ground down into abject slavery," that the Christians in the Russian zone, young and old, are daily exposed to very strong anti-Christian influences in schools and in public life and that many are being weaned and torn away from their church, nevertheless we have every reason to believe that despite or even because of such insidious attacks on their church, these Lutheran Christians are rallying to her support and gaining support from her wherever the Gospel of Jesus Christ is still being preached in her pulpits.

P. PETERS.

Cooperation in Externals Only. — The Greek Orthodox Church made public a report in which conditions are stated for the continued affiliation of this church body with the World Council of Churches. The conditions enumerated in the report are contained in seven propositions published by *Religious News Service*. They read as follows:

(1) The direct aim of the ecumenical movement is the cooperation of all participating Churches on practical matters only. The cooperation is based on the condition that the Churches having in common a belief in the Trinity of God will form a single front against the numerous enemies of Christianity.

It must be clearly explained to the Churches that sterile discussions of church union among confessional representatives deeply disagreeing with us is unacceptable to the Orthodox Church, for which no other perception about the Church can exist than which it holds.

(2) The above views are valid for any religious meeting in which our Church might be called to participate. In accordance with a recent decision of the Holy Synod of the Greek Church, her participation in interdenominational meetings can be possible only if practical matters are to be discussed in them.

(3) Official participation of the Orthodox Church in the World Council's Commission on Faith and Order must be avoided, since the main purpose of this commission is unionistic, on the basis of doctrinal discussions. Greek Orthodox theologians can only participate unofficially in the commission and solely in order that Orthodox doctrinal teaching may be made known.

(4) Traveling expenses of delegates must be paid by the Orthodox Church herself. Charitable payment of these expenses by the World Council must be stopped in the future as belittling the dignity of our Church.

(5) Orthodox participants should be reserved in taking part in services with non-Orthodox participants in assemblies, as this is against our holy canons. Most of the members of the Greek delegation think that the participation of Greek bishops in the assemblies and committees of the World Council should be avoided altogether.

(6) The Greek Orthodox members of the Council, in the event that the Church's continued participation is decided upon, must be appointed by the home churches and not by the assembly.

(7) The Greek language should be used, at least formally, as one of the official languages of the ecumenical movement, because the New Testament was written in it.

These propositions or conditions outlined presuppose the claim of the Orthodox Church that it is "the continuation of the Church of the first eight centuries, which is the holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church" and that it possesses "the entire Christian truth." Making such a claim it can, of course, not cooperate with other churches except in a discussion of "practical problems" outside the purely religious realm. It also must frown upon the participation of its members in services with non-Orthodox participants and even upon the participation of its bishops in the assemblies and committees of the World Council. Here is a church true to its own doctrinal teaching and confession. The *Christian Century* of September 14 in an article "The Greeks — In or Out?" clearly betrays its impatience with this outspoken stand, since it represents a repudiation of the whole ecumenical movement with its merging of "Faith and Order" and "Life and Work." Indeed, if the Greek Orthodox Church wants to remain true to its principles it will have to withdraw from the World Council of Churches, which does not recognize the membership of a church that only seeks cooperation in externals.

P. PETERS.

Goethe's Religious Development. — Among the many lectures delivered during the bicentennial celebration of Goethe's birth, Walther Voelker's on Goethe's religious development deserves special mention. It belongs to the cycle of Goethe-lectures delivered at the Johannes-Gutenberg-University of Mayence in memory of Germany's great poet.

Walther Voelker first of all calls our attention to the religious customs of a "waning orthodoxy" in Germany, as they still obtained in the home of Goethe's parents and as Goethe from his earliest youth learned to practice them. Kneeling, Goethe as a child prayed his morning prayer, learned many Bible verses, hymns, and the Catechism by heart, attended Sunday services, wrote down the Sunday sermons, and after his confirmation went to confession, the confessional in those days still standing in the Frankfort churches. In the atmosphere of this "conventional piety," which had all the signs of a sound orthodoxy, but lacked its power, the lad

Goethe grew up only to reject the Christian dogma in later years and to turn to rationalism after he had tasted of Pietism.

Thanks to the discovery in 1922 of twelve letters written by Goethe to his friend Langer we now know that as university student in Leipzig he already came under the influence of Pietism. After his return to Frankfort this was still more the case. Frankfort was, as Voelker points out, the citadel of Pietism, where Spener exerted his influence for twenty years (1666-1686) and wrote his "Pia Desideria," where Zinzendorf spent a year (1736-1737), and where the Moravian congregation was flanked by other separatistic movements. The Evangelical Church itself organized conventicles, in order to satisfy the wishes of many of its members. Goethe's mother and Fräulein von Klettenberg belonged to these circles and therefore hours of pietistic devotion were regularly held in the home of Goethe's parents. In a letter to his friend Langer Goethe stated he liked these devotional gatherings and that he was waiting for the hour of his conversion. Voelker also calls our attention to the fact that the Pietism in Frankfort had formed an amalgam with alchemistic, cabbalistic, pantheistic, and mystical ideas, so that not only Goethe's physician, but also Fräulein von Klettenberg and Goethe himself had their chemical laboratories, where they fervently sought after the life-giving elixir. In 1769 Goethe spent some time in the Moravian colony, Marienborn, and there entered into a still closer contact with the Brethren Church. Also during his Strassburg days Goethe continued to remain in close touch with the Brethren and even attended Communion. During his Rhine journey he visited their congregation in Neuwied, where he met with leaders of Pietism.

Goethe, however, never went heart and hand with Pietism. Voelker mentions two main reasons. The one is that Germany's great poet rejected the "consciousness of sin" as advocated in Pietistic circles. It was Goethe's conviction that man is good, a conviction to which he later gave expression in his *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, where he declares himself to be a Pelagian. Consequently he did not recognize the conflict of good and evil, but looked upon the world as a realm exclusively permeated by divine forces. Nevertheless Goethe's contact with Pietism greatly influenced his religious development. To it are to be traced his purely ethical *Privatchristentum*, which suffered no dogmatical ties and church affiliations to restrict it. Pietism had also taught him to observe and to analyze his *Gefühlsleben* and thus laid the groundwork for some of his future works, even for the use of words such as *schöne Seele*, *fühlen*, *Gefühl*, *still*, *Stille*, *Einfalt*, *Dumpfheit*, and many others. These words were part and parcel of mysticism which reached Goethe through Pietism. The writings of mystics which he read in Frankfort were in turn founded on Neo-Platonism, which had such a lasting influence on him.

It was Herder especially, who led Goethe from Pietism to a humanitarian religion which attributes one and the same source to religion,

philosophy, and art, which does not recognize any contradiction between poetry and religion. Under Herder's influence the Biblical, personal, and extra-mundane God was rejected and the god of nature, who reveals himself in all the forces of nature was worshipped instead. Herder continued to exert the greater influence on Goethe, even after Shaftesbury, Leibnitz, and Spinoza began to play a great roll in Goethe's life. Herder taught him to interpret Spinoza from the perspective of Neo-Platonism and the only influence that Spinoza exerted on Goethe was a negative one, weaning him away from Christian views, from the belief in a supernatural revelation, from a differentiation of spirit and matter, of the temporal and the eternal. The God of the Bible with its anthropomorphisms was not Goethe's god any longer. It was the god of whom he spoke in his *Ephemeriden*: *Deum non nisi perspecta natura cognoscimus*. Consequently Goethe sought God *in herbis et lapidibus* and was convinced that nature leads one to God, that we see God in nature and nature in God, and called this conviction the basis of his whole existence.

Nature was also the viewpoint from which Goethe viewed man. Since nature is permeated by divine forces and therefore good, man also, who takes part in nature, must be good. This is the premise for Goethe's denial of evil and his reason for speaking of an innate moral goodness of man. All those who are good and wise, who have reached the highest stage of religious development and have left the two lower stages, the ethnic and the Christian religion, behind, are members of the "invisible church." In his *Iphigenie*, which Voelker calls Goethe's "gospel of true humanitarianism," mankind is pictured as having reached these heights. In Goethe's eyes mankind's great representative of such a religious development was Christ, but Christ as man, as sage, as our ideal.

Goethe's ideal religion embodies all the treasures of culture, every lofty and exalted idea produced by the mind of man. His *Urreligion* is the ideal type of religion and all positive religions are but offshoots of it. There is no need anymore for church-affiliation, for confessions, for dogmas. Still less is there, as Voelker points out, any need in Goethe's religion for a mediator and a savior. No redemption from sin, no cross, no repentance are necessary. The Apostle Paul is looked upon by Goethe as the adulterator of the true Christian religion. *Das Märchen von Christus* was a term which Goethe used, and in the year of his death he told Eckermann that a divine revelation is to be found both in Christ and in the sun. Goethe only recognized a Christianity in as far as it had absorbed the truth of the *Urreligion*. The three ideals of his *Urreligion* are the credo of rationalism: God, Immortality, and Virtue. Goethe was a rationalist and borrowed from rationalism, although he entered in upon a passionate controversy with its most radical representative, C. F. Bahrdt. As a rationalist he was greatly impressed by Lessing's *Nathan* and by the ethical ideals of the lodge, which he voiced in his poem: *Edel sei der Mensch, hilfreich und gut*.

Voelker speaks of a "process of secularization of Christendom," in which Goethe together with Leibnitz, Herder, and Kant were involved, and which only permitted one to evaluate Christianity from a cultural viewpoint. This was also the viewpoint from which Goethe sought to appraise the Reformation. He criticized Luther as one who had curbed and checked the progress of culture, and the Reformation as a trifling and confusing event in the history of mankind (*verworrener Quark*).

Voelker closes his article with the statement that Biblical Christianity cannot accept Goethe as a guide in religious matters, although he coped with religious questions all his life; that we can, however, only do justice to Goethe's writings by having and gaining an understanding of their religious elements.

In asking ourselves what we have to say about Goethe's religion as sketched by Professor Voelker in his lecture, we answer with the words of Dr. Arndt which we find in the September issue of the *Concordia Theological Monthly* (p. 704) in reference to the picture which Schweitzer drew of Goethe in Aspen, Colorado: "The believing Christian, of course, is shocked. We here (in the ideas of the great German poet) have an implied profanation of what is most holy in the universe, a trampling under foot of the precious Gospel of the redemption through the sacrifice of Jesus Christ our Lord. Schweitzer evidently shares the views of Goethe to a great extent" and, as we must add, many of our contemporaries who are parading as banner-bearers of Christianity.

P. PETERS.

Fragments of Biblical Books Found. — Scarcely more than two years ago a discovery of Biblical texts much older than the manuscripts of the tenth century of our Christian era seemed out of the question. The find of the Jerusalem Scrolls, however, has suddenly thrown scholars back 1000 years and more in their reckoning. But not only as to the age but also as to the number of different documents found in the cave located at the northwestern shore of the Dead Sea scholars have experienced the surprise of their life. No less than seven separate documents were hidden in the cave and discovered by Bedouins. Although the find was made in the forepart of 1947, not all of the scrolls as of May, 1949, have been identified. Of the five scrolls belonging to the Hebrew University the fifth, as *The Biblical Archaeologist* of May informs us, "is now being unrolled but is not yet identified." And of the Jerusalem scrolls, which are being publicized by *The American Schools of Oriental Research*, an Aramaic document has not yet been unrolled, "which may prove to be one of the most important of the entire find." Added to these seven documents, however, many fragments, according to latest reports no less than 200 and a few pieces of papyrus, have also been discovered in the cave. Five of these are identified as "the Genesis, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Judges, and Jubilees fragments" (*ibid.*, pp. 32 and 34). And again, in addition

to these five manuscript fragments *The Biblical Archaeologist* also announces the finding of three fragments of the Biblical book of Daniel (p. 33). These fragments contain the following verses: 1, 10-16; 2, 2-6 (including the point where the Aramaic part of Daniel begins), and 3, 23-30, also in Aramaic. "It is interesting to note," *The Biblical Archaeologist* adds, "that the names Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego appear on the fragments. The text is substantially the same as that of our current Hebrew Bibles (the Masoretic text). The chief differences, like those in the Isaiah manuscripts, have to do with the spelling of words."

It is also surprising that Aramaic portions of it have been discovered, especially Daniel 2, 2-6, where the Aramaic part of Daniel begins both in our Masoretic Bible and on the fragment. Scholars have always been "inclined to assume that 1: 1-2: 4a was translated from the Aramaic into the Hebrew" (cf. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 762). Now we have a proof from the second century at least that "the inception of the Aramaic in 2, 4b . . . may well have been intentional" (*ibid.*). And Aramaic writings (cf. *Archaeologist* of May, 1949, p. 46), much older than our scrolls, prove that courtiers addressing their king in Aramaic was quite in keeping with the times in which Nebuchadnezzar lived and Daniel wrote.

Hardly of less value is the Leviticus fragment which represents a part of the so-called Holiness Code (Lev. 17-26). The fragment differs from all the others as to its form of the alphabet which is much like that of the Siloam Inscription of the eighth century. While the Isaiah Scroll and the other manuscripts are written in the later square characters, which were also used by the Masoretes, the Leviticus manuscript has the older characters. Only in the Habakkuk Midrash, as we are informed, the names *Jahweh* and *El* are written in the old characters. Does this prove that the Leviticus fragment is so much older than the others? Not necessarily. Its ancient script may have been "done by a man with archaizing interest." Paleographic experts will have to decide in time whether it is an eighth or a second century document.

Speaking of archaizing interest, we are reminded of what Dr. Albright, the eminent American archaeologist, has to say about the archaic orthography of the Masoretic text in comparison with the orthography of the Isaiah and Habakkuk Scrolls: "The orthography of the Masoretic text . . . is much more archaic than that of our Scrolls." This "indicates that the archetype of the Masorah . . . was based on manuscripts of the Prophets going back to pre-Maccabean times." Therefore "the Masoretic text of Isaiah and Habakkuk is, on the whole, better than that of the new Scrolls, though the latter are a good thousand years older than the former." This justifies us to conclude that "the standardization of the text took place earlier than most modern scholars have supposed." The Masoretic text was not handed down to us from about 200 after but rather from 200 before Christ.

P. PETERS.

NEWS WITHOUT COMMENT *

From Religious News Service and Other Sources

Negro Congregations will be admitted as members for the first time in the history of the Western District of the Lutheran Church -- Missouri Synod. That decision was made at the close of a five-day convention of the Western District. It means Negro congregations will participate in policy-making meetings on an equal footing with the other churches in the District. Previously, Negro congregations were under the control of the Synodical Conference Mission Board. Each may now send delegates to District conventions. The convention took no action on the question of admitting Negroes as members of the various District churches, leaving it up to each individually to decide. Admittance of Negro congregations came after the three principal Negro congregations in St. Louis had applied for membership. One of these churches, Holy Sacraments, has a mixed congregation, with Negroes predominating. Whether to admit Negro congregations was the subject of a year's consideration by a committee of clergymen and laymen appointed by the Rev. E. L. Roschke, District president. It was the committee which prepared and introduced the resolution permitting the entry of such congregations for the first time in the 96-year history of the District.

Evangelical Free Church delegates to the 65th annual conference of the Evangelical Free Church of America (Swedish) voted 197 to 13 to merge with the Evangelical Free Church Association (Norwegian). The merger plan was approved by the Association at its national convention in Britt, Iowa, by a vote of 73 to 5. It will now go to individual churches for their consideration and then will be referred back to the 1950 conventions of the two church bodies for final action.

Australian Representatives of the two Lutheran synods in Australia took a further step toward eventual union when pastors of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in Australia and the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Australia (Missouri Synod) living in New South Wales district met in joint conference in September. Like the joint conference held by pastors in South Australia last June, this conference approved the "theses of agreement" adopted by the Inter-Synodical Committees. The theses cover church-fellowship, joint prayer and worship, conversion and election.

* Recently it was brought to our attention that the news published under this heading is being regarded by some of our readers as reflecting our editorial views. We hasten to inform our readers that this need not at all be the case. News without comment have been added in order to supply our readers with a maximum of information in regard to the most recent events pertaining to church and school abroad and at home. At the same time we seek to select such news as can be of value to us for future reference. Should at any time such news appear under this heading which actually cries for comment, our readers may rest assured that comment will be forthcoming. — The Editorial Staff.

Pastors of both synods in the Queensland district are to meet in November and if they also give their approval, it will mean that three-fourths of the Lutheran clergy in Australia will have approved the work done by the Central Committees. The committees are now concentrating on the Doctrine of the Church. The conference held in South Australia in June was the first joint meeting to be held by pastors of the two Lutheran groups in sixty years. — *News Bureau, National Lutheran Council.*

Lutheran Union Committees Meet. — A Statement to the Press by the Delegations of the American Lutheran Church, The Evangelical Lutheran Church, and The United Evangelical Lutheran Church as of September 16, 1949, has the following wording:

Upon invitation of Dr. N. C. Carlsen, Blair, Neb., president of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church, official delegations representing the American Lutheran Church, The Evangelical Lutheran Church, and the United Evangelical Lutheran Church met in Chicago, Friday, September 16, 1949, to explore avenues of approach to possible merger.

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted by the three delegations:

Whereas our respective bodies have long enjoyed the blessings of close fellowship in faith and work; and

Whereas the mandate of the Lord and our love for the Church urge us to seek ever fuller expression of this God-given unity; and

Whereas we are earnestly committed to the ultimate unity which shall include all Lutherans in America, and to the continued strengthening of the National Lutheran Council; therefore

Be It Resolved, That the official delegations of the American Lutheran Church, The Evangelical Lutheran Church, and the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in accordance with mandates given by their respective Churches and as a forward step in the unfolding unification of the Lutheran Churches in America, each shall elect two members of a Committee of Six instructed to submit to a later meeting of these delegations steps toward organic union of the American Lutheran Church, The Evangelical Lutheran Church, and the United Evangelical Lutheran Church, the delegations in turn to submit a joint report to the conventions of these three Churches.

Be It Further Resolved, That the delegations of the American Lutheran Church, The Evangelical Lutheran Church, and the United Evangelical Lutheran Church, in joint meeting respectfully suggest that the mission boards and other like agencies of these Churches jointly study their tasks, seeking effective expression for that unity of faith and purpose which is now looking forward to organizational unity.

To the Committee of Six provided for in the first Resolution, the following are elected: from the American Lutheran Church, Dr. Wm. L.

Young, Columbus, Ohio, executive secretary of the Board of Education, and Dr. Harold Yochum, Columbus, Ohio, president of Capital University; from The Evangelical Lutheran Church, Dr. T. F. Gullixson, St. Paul, president of Luther Theological Seminary, and Dr. Martin Anderson, Chicago, president of the Eastern District; from the United Evangelical Lutheran Church, Dr. Carlsen and Dr. Richard Morton, Blair, Nebraska, president of Dana College.

A further meeting of the three delegations will be held as soon as the Committee of Six is ready to report. — *Lutheran Herald*.

Destruction of Libraries. German scientific libraries have suffered heavily in consequence of the war and its aftermath. The University of Frankfort has lost two-thirds; Giessen, nine-tenths; and Würzburg, three-fourths of its books. The buildings of the state library at Munich, Bavaria, were severely damaged, and 500,000 of its 2,200,000 volumes were destroyed. The university library of Munich lost about two-thirds of its 1,000,000 volumes. All the buildings of the library of the University of Bonn were reduced to ruins but it managed to save three-fourths of its books. The library at Münster is almost a total loss. Kiel succeeded in rescuing only 250,000 of its 516,000 volumes during a conflagration in 1942. The two great libraries of Leipzig, the university library and the "Deutsche Bücherei," have sustained considerable damage. Germany's most magnificent library, the state library in the Russian zone of Berlin (formerly "Staatsbibliothek," now "Oeffentliche wissenschaftliche Bibliothek"), distributed its contents in various parts of Germany during the war; but the sections so distributed have only partially been returned to Berlin, so that there is considerable uncertainty about their fate. Only Heidelberg and Freiburg i. B. seem to have saved all their books. Losses are still being incurred by the German libraries through accident, theft, and confiscation. Göttingen and Marburg, which had stored their books in the apparently safe recesses of mines, lost 60,000 and 50,000 of their books respectively by fire. — *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, July, 1949.

The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, a standard encyclopedia for libraries, seminaries, colleges and Bible scholars is being reissued by the Baker Book House of Grand Rapids. The firm announced it has obtained the rights for a modernized reprint edition from Funk and Wagnalls, with the first of the thirteen volumes slated to appear in November under a book-a-month schedule. Dr. Lefferts A. Loetscher, associate professor of Church History at Princeton Theological Seminary, will serve as editor-in-chief with a staff of recognized theologians, each of whom will be an authority in his department. The modernizing program will include two supplementary volumes featuring new theological thought and information on topics of the original set, plus new articles

of recent origin and interest and biographies of contemporary theologians and religious leaders. The Schaff-Herzog encyclopedia is based on the German "Realencyklopädie" founded by J. J. Herzog and edited by Albert Hauck, with the English edition prepared under the guidance of the church historian Philip Schaff.

Discovery of a Port of Solomon. On a hill north of Tel Aviv, at the mouth of the Yarkon River, the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society, under the direction of Dr. Benjamin Maisler, has unearthed a hitherto unknown city. Its population was about 2000. It seems to have been founded about 1000 B. C. Archaeologists conjecture that it may have been the port used by Solomon to receive the cedars imported for his buildings from the Lebanon. The wine and oil exported by Israel may also have left this harbor. These conjectures are supported by two Hebrew inscriptions found on the spot: one refers to 1,100 measures of oil from the king; the other, to "Ophir gold for Bethhoron." — *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, July, 1949.

Darius' Inscription on the Rock of Behistun. In 1835, Sir George Rawlinson translated the inscription beneath the ornate bas reliefs on the Rock of Behistun. It was written in three languages: Old Persian, Elamite, and Babylonian. In 1904, his work was checked and revised by an expedition from the British Museum. But four other columns of cuneiform inscriptions to the right of the base reliefs had been left inaccessible by the artisans of Darius the Great, so that they had not been copied or deciphered up to recent times. However, George G. Cameron, Professor of Near Eastern languages at the University of Michigan, has finally succeeded in copying and deciphering the hitherto inaccessible and unstudied columns. He managed to come face to face with them by ascending a scaffold attached to steel spikes driven into the side of the mountain, 200 feet higher. The hazardous descent was made every day for three weeks beginning on November 7, 1948. The inscription was not only copied by hand but also reproduced by specially designed rubber molds which have been brought to the United States. It is said to contain nothing more than an exact duplicate of the inscription on the Rock already known and deciphered. — *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, July, 1949.

REVIEWERS' DESK

The Lord's Supper and You. 15 pages, 4×6. Price, 10c; less in quantities. — Northwestern Publishing House.

The pamphlet was written for the purpose of stimulating attendance at the Lord's Table. It rightly warns against methods which smack of a fire sale. It, rather, tries to encourage Christians by pointing to the great

blessings which are to be received in Communion, and to the great love of our Lord which went to the sacrifice of His own Son in order to prepare this rich meal for us. It does this by presenting the matter under four heads: "1. A Seal of the Forgiveness of Our Sins. — 2. As Oft as Ye Do It. — 3. Let a Man Examine Himself. — 4. Who Then Is Worthy?" Appended is the last of the "Christian Questions."

Recommended for mass distribution.

M.

A Catechism of Differences By Harold C. Wicke. Paper bound, 67 pages. Northwestern Publishing House. Price, 35c.

We have repeatedly been asked for some source of information on the differences of doctrine which have divided the various Lutheran bodies of America in the past and which are under discussion — or should be — in the current efforts at uniting these groups. While Pastor Wicke's booklet is not the first publication of this kind, it is one of the most useful. It takes up a number of pertinent points (Inspiration, Conversion, Election, Justification, the doctrines of the Church, of Sunday, of the Essence and Object of the Lord's Supper, and the Millennium) and lets competent spokesmen state the position of their respective bodies on these questions. The differences become very plain in the process. The purpose of this procedure is stated by the author. "By pointing out these differences we do not seek to perpetuate them, but desire to examine them in the pure light of the Word of God, so that errors may be recognized as such and eventually be removed in obedience to the Holy Word."

If our pastors will make this booklet available to their congregations they will find that it meets a very real demand by providing the answers to a number of questions about which many of our members are genuinely concerned in these times.

E. R.

Lands of the Cross and Crescent. Aspects of Middle Eastern and Occidental Affairs by Cyrus H. Gordon. Ventnor Publishers, Inc., Ventnor, New Jersey, 1948. Price, \$3.00.

The Bible. The Book of God and of Man, by James A. Montgomery. Ventnor Publishers, Inc., Ventnor, New Jersey, 1948. Price, \$3.75.

Ventnor Publishers have put out two books of recent date written by scholars well-known in their respective fields of research. Cyrus H. Gordon is the author of "The Living Past" and of "Poems from Ugarit," the latter having been reviewed in the 1944 issue of the *Quartalschrift* (p. 274f.). As such he is acquainted with various phases of the ancient world. His travels as an archaeologist and later as a soldier only added to his knowledge of the ancient and the modern world. He not only lived in Turkey prior to 1931, but has also been in Iran, Iraq, Palestine, Egypt,

North Africa, and Italy as recently as 1945. While the author is undoubtedly a judge of life and customs in the Near Eastern World, he seems no less acquainted with conditions in the Western World. Therefore in Part II of this book he has written on Italy, Vatican City, Germany, France, the British Isles, Sweden, and the United States of America. What the author has to say about America's greatest universities, their teaching staff and scholarship has impressed itself most strongly on the mind of this reviewer and is worth the price of the book alone.

James A. Montgomery, professor emeritus, was professor of Old Testament at the Philadelphia Divinity School from 1899 to 1935 and lecturer in Hebrew at the Graduate School of the University of Pennsylvania since 1909, advancing to the professorship which he held with distinction until his retirement. He also was director and president of the American Schools of Oriental Research and edited both the *Journal of Biblical Literature* and the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* for a number of years. His most important works are his commentaries on Daniel and on the Book of Kings. In his present work the author surveys the Scriptures both of the Old and the New Testament for their human contents. He does this under the following headings: The Revelation of God in History, The Bible: A Book of Humanity, Men and Women of the Old Testament and the Apocrypha, Men and Women of the New Testament, The Ego of the Psalms, and The Revelation of God in Nature. Throughout the pages of his book the author endeavors to have us gain a "vista of humanity" as given to us by the Bible. He wants us to see the Bible as "a book of divinity," but also to recognize it as "a book of humanity," and to realize that "the Book which would reveal God" also "reveals man."

We agree with Professor Montgomery in this that the Bible does not only reveal God to us but also man. Yet we hasten to add that the Bible in revealing man does not only exhibit him to us with all his human traits and characteristics, his joys and sorrows, but above all lets us see him as the righteous God sees him, who "tries the hearts and the reins" (P̄s. 7, 9). God sees man differently than we do. God sees man's impenitence and man's evil works, man's repentance and man's good works, and wants us to see ourselves as He sees us. This is actually the "vista" which the Bible reveals to us and which "sets it apart from the scriptures of the other great world religions." This should have been emphasized more by the author. Or would he call this "theologizing the Bible merely as a sacred *unicum*." But what is the Bible without this!

Still we are grateful to Professor Montgomery that he has called our attention to various phases of the human side of the lives of the Old Testament characters, which we certainly do not want to overlook when studying the Bible and which makes the reading of his book interesting reading.

P. PETERS.

Christmas. Edited by R. E. Haugan. Augsburg Publishing House, 425 So. Fourth Street, Minneapolis 15, Minnesota. Price: Paper, \$1.00; Cloth, \$2.00.

Yuletide. Edited by R. E. Haugan. Augsburg Publishing House, 425 So. Fourth Street, Minneapolis 15, Minnesota. Price: 35c.

We are happy that the October number of our Quarterly can again welcome its two Christmas friends and call the attention of its readers to these two issues of "Christmas" and "Yuletide." "Christmas" is appearing for the nineteenth time and is the work of many writers, artists, and craftsmen. "Yuletide" not as large in size is nevertheless on the same artistic level with its larger companion. Randolph E. Haugan has again done excellent work in editing and compiling the many articles, stories, poems, hymns, decorations, and illustrations. The Augsburg Publishing House is to be commended on these two fine Christmas publications.

P. PETERS.

Jesus Tischgast. Ein Beicht- und Abendmahlbüchlein für die Jugend von Ludwig Crebe. Lutheraner-Verlag, G. m. b. H., Frankfurt am Main, Tamusstr. 43.

Dieses Abendmahlbüchlein, das lange vergriffen war, erscheint hiermit von neuem. Der Verfasser versteht es, die Jugend in herzandringer Weise zur Selbstprüfung beim Gang zum Tisch des Herrn anzuhalten. Nicht weniger ist es ihm gegeben, das heilspendende Gnadenmahl in all seiner Kostbarkeit dem jungen Volk vor Augen zu führen. Wir fragen uns nur, ob wir noch eine konfirmierte Jugend in unsern Gemeinden haben, die zu einem solchen Erbauungsbüchlein in deutscher Sprache greifen würde. Wir müssen dies wohl verneinen. Und doch eignet es sich gut für alle die Familien, die noch deutsche Andachten halten und unsere eigenen deutschen Andachtbücher gebrauchen. Vater oder Mutter in solchen Familien können der Jugend daraus vorlesen und sich selber an dem Inhalt erbauen.

P. PETERS.

Der Herr ist mein Hirte. Tägliche Hausandachten 8. Sonntag nach Trinitatis bis Sonnabend nach 15. Sonntag nach Trinitatis von Pfarrer Dr. Gerhard Gesh und Pfarrer Heinrich Huebener. Im Anhang Gebete Luthers. Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, G. m. b. H., Berlin. Druck von Johannes Herrmann, Zwickau, Sachsen (9). Preis 65 Pfg.

Das vorliegende Andachtbuch ist Heft 3 in einer Reihe von 6 Heften, wovon die drei letzten noch im Laufe dieses Jahres im gleichen Verlag erscheinen werden. Die beiden ersten Hefte tragen den Titel: **Durch Leiden zur Herrlichkeit** und **Wachet, stehet im Glauben!** und werden jeweilig von einem Pastor der Breslau und der Sächsischen Freikirche verfaßt. Diese kurzen Andachten eignen sich sehr gut für jung und alt und sollten abwechselnd mit den deutschen Andachtbüchlein gebraucht werden, die laufend vom Concordia Publishing House herausgegeben werden. P. PETERS.