



"Meditate
upon these things;
give thyself
wholly to them;
that thy profiting
may appear unto all"

I Timothy 4:15

Journal of Theology

Church of the Lutheran Confession

Words and the Word

If the Bible, as we affirm, is divine revelation, the character and content of its language is of paramount significance.

This would indeed not be true if we postulated a revelation which merely conveys God's thoughts and purposes by communicating human experiences and reactions in divine-human encounters of the past and leaving us to find in their significance to us a subjective message and conviction.

The liberal-rational theological schools have reduced the language of Scripture to a position of relative insignificance. What the words of the Bible say, what facts they may express, what concepts they represent, allegedly does not matter too much. What they meant when written is of even less moment.

The earlier rationalism that flourished in the latter half of the 19th century was content to demote God's Word by refusing to recognize ALL Scripture as inscribed revelation and insisting that portions of the sacred record are of purely human origin and composition. It was against these opponents of plenary verbal inspiration that the "Brief Statement of the Doctrinal Position of the Ev. Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States" (1932) testified that. . . . "Since the Holy Scriptures are the Word of God, it goes without saying that they contain no errors or contradictions, but that they are in all their parts and words the infallible truth, also in those parts which treat of historical, geographical, and other secular matters, John 10:35. We reject the doctrine which under the name of science has gained wide popularity in the Church of our day, that Holy Scripture is not in all its parts the Word of God, but in part the Word of God and in part the word of man and hence does, or at least might, contain error."

But the present century saw the emergence in force of another, equally aggressive yet more complex attack upon the verbal concept of revelation. It claims to be a "theology of the Word;" but any resemblance it may bear to the orthodox character suggested by that phrase is purely coincidental. For it holds that the Bible is divine revelation, not because its very words are inspired, but because as a fallible, human book it nevertheless bears witness to God as He revealed Himself in the experiences of individuals and groups of the past. In this view, "technically speaking, the Bible is a record or witness to revelation." 1) Thus while the Bible as such is not inspired, yet it does inspire, and enables us to apprehend divine truth as we encounter God personally in our lives.

"The Bible holds, in this view, a purely instrumental role. The content of special revelation is to be determined not by exegesis of Scripture, since not the Bible but the Spirit presently encountered is regarded as the locus of revelation. Special revelation is a continuing process, not a completed product identical with the Bible." 2)

Where this concept of revelation prevails, the quality and force of language is, of course, of minor importance as a factor in man's attitude toward the Holy Scriptures. It is not our purpose at this point to elaborate upon the premises of dialectical theology, its metaphysics or its epistemology. It hardly merits such laborious attention on our part. As a Gnosticism in modern dress it makes a mockery of the scriptural doctrine both of the *Λόγος* and of the *λόγος Θεός*; and the "revelation" of which it speaks produces, not an apprehension of the God of love and His eternal, objective, saving truth, but an intellectual caricature representing Him as a god made in man's image and offering a faith that rests upon spiritual concepts as inconstant as the moon. In the heavens

1) "The Inspiration of Scripture," by Dewey M. Beegle; Westminster Press, 1963. Dr. Beegle, a "conservative" Free Methodist, teaches at Biblical Seminary, New York. His is substantially the position represented by Dr. Scharlemann of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis. See the definitive critique of Dr. Beegle's book in Christianity Today, Vol. VII, No. 15, p. 26ff and p. 39ff

2) "Divine Revelation and the Bible," by Carl H. F. Henry. (The quotation is accurate despite the obvious ellipsis.)

of existential theology there are no fixed stars of truth and no well-ordered constellations, but only a milky way whose dim and wavering reflection may illuminate the shallow pool of the individual soul. 3)

It requires but a moment's thought on the part of the intelligent Christian to realize that this eery light, of which God is allegedly the source, might just as easily be the glow shed by the fire of demons. Discerning between God and Satan clad as an angel of light is impossible for sinners who presume to live by an immanent enlightenment devoid of conceptual truth. Yet such theology, brazenly professing, as it does, to have Jesus of Nazareth in its camp, cannot well afford to deny that an encounter with the devil is as possible as an encounter with God.

The personal spiritual life, as well as the ecumenical church life which pulsates in such an atmosphere of arbitrary and shifting subjectivity, is a unity in Babel where words and language can mean almost anything to anyone at any given moment. It is this collapse of respect for objective truth in modern theology which makes possible the current optimism toward the efforts in rapprochement between Roman Catholicism and what is so improbably called Protestantism in our day, particularly in the area of the relationship between Scripture and Tradition. As matters now stand, neo-liberal Protestantism has less to lose in this project of Scripture-assassination than does the Antichrist himself, since Rome relies upon the verbalism of Scripture for at least a part of the basic validation of its ecclesiastical system, and thus sits "in the Temple" of that Triune God from whom existential theology is vigorously divorcing itself. So vigorously, indeed, that it is frightening to observe the rapidly multiplying signs of disintegration of genuine Biblicalism even in hitherto rock-ribbed conservative circles. Christianity Today has recently repeated the findings of a poll taken six years ago which showed that even then 52% of the protestant clergy which wanted to be known as "conservative or fundamental rather than liberal or neoorthodox" were either unsure of the doctrine of scriptural inerrancy or rejected it outright. Today attacks against that doctrine are being launched, not merely from the liberal circle of Christendom, but from the halls of evangelical seminaries.

3) Cf. Vol. I, No. I of the Theological Journal, p. 26ff.

Christianity Today calls this a drift. It seems more like a tidal wave that threatens to engulf what is left of nominally Biblical theology.

As Christians dedicated to a defense of the normative character of Biblical revelation, we desire to accept, and do hold, the proposition that the Bible can be normative only because its language is God-breathed. The Word of God consists of words. The relation between these two concepts is of vital significance.

What is language? If, as we postulate, our God has revealed Himself and communicated to us His thoughts through the medium of the written Word, then it behooves us to consider the nature of language which has become for us the formal instrument of our salvation.

The attempt to define language may initially seem to be a simple undertaking. But as the effort is made, the complexities of the task become painfully apparent. The student of this question discovers, first of all, that he must use language, and thereby makes language self-defining. He is baffled, moreover, by the fact that experts in the fields of philology, psychology and logic vary widely in their approach to a definition and that their pronouncements differ as did those of the famous three blind men solemnly appraising the structure of an elephant.

If we were to exhort one another to forthright testimony by saying: "Let us call a spade a spade and let the chips fall where they may," we are immediately confronted, not only by an obviously inappropriate metaphor but by an elementary lesson of language as well. We observe that a spade (the word) is not a spade (the well-known digging implement). The word is merely an arbitrary symbol of the thing meant. Language therefore is a system of such symbols by the use of which men communicate to their kind the concepts, ideas, emotions and desires, the objective as well as the subjective concerns with which their lives are involved. These include not only visible and tangible objects, but a great amount of "inaccessible" matter for which, above all, human beings yearn to find systematic means of expression and which, even in self-communication, the mind finds necessary to reduce to linguistic terms.

The function of language is to supply a code verbalization for each of these many interests. When this system of symbols is employed to give vocal expression to what is called

"the inventory of the mind," language becomes speech. And when its symbols are converted to visible forms, we call it writing.

It is interesting to note the distinctions between language as such and its two forms of usage. Scripture itself takes cognizance of the difference between language and speech. Thus in Psalm 19, after saying "Day unto day uttereth speech (OMER), and night unto night sheweth knowledge (YECHAWEH`DA'ATH), David declares:

אֵין דְּבָרִים כָּלִי נִשְׁמָע קוֹלָם:

"There is no speech (OMER) and there is no language (D'BARIM, words);⁴⁾ not is being heard (Niphal participle) their voice." The Waw heightens the contrast. Not only is there no speech, no vocal utterance forthcoming from the heavens and the firmament which declare the glory of God (v. 1); they cannot even be said to have a language in our terms of reference. The plural suffix in KOLAWM must refer to HASHAMAYIM and HARAQIYAH in v. 1. Thus in beautifully poetic style David affirms that while the created heavens are denied the ordinary facilities for communication with mankind, they manage through daylight and darkness, through the phenomena of nature observable on earth, to declare to us the glory of God.

Our immediate interest centers on the fact that David divides between the concept of language as such and of speech as a form of its employment. A similar distinction, for a more harshly pragmatic and less poetic purpose, is made by our Lord in His sharp exchange with the Jews as recorded in John 8. In v. 43 we find Him saying: *Σὶὰ τὴν λαλιὰν τὴν ἔμην οὐ γινώσκατε; ὅτι οὐ δύνασθε ἀκοῦειν τὸν λόγον τὸν ἔμον.* Here again the traditional translation of the passage causes us difficulty; and the modern translations, which might have served us usefully by supplying careful textual study at points such as this, fail us despite the fact that the correct linguistic observations have long been available through the work of men like Zahn, Robertson, and Lenski. The *ὅτι* in this verse is not causative, but consecutive as so frequently in John (7:35; 8:28; 12:49, et al.). Jesus said: "Why do you not understand my language? (I ask this) since you are unable to hear

⁴⁾ The Septuagint translates: *οὐκ εἶσιν λαλῶντες οὐδὲ λόγον.....*

my word (speech)." The KJV and RSV reverse the order of the terms and thus obscure the sense of the question. The Jews proved to be deaf to the Savior's oral message (λόγος). This prompted the assumption that they had no real comprehension of His language (λαλῶ). The Savior did not, of course, question the Jews' knowledge of Aramaic. He uses the term for language in a metonymical sense: the Jews understood the syntax, but not the frame of reference in which Jesus spoke. Despite the metonymy, however, the distinction between language and speech is plainly predicated in this passage.

While language is "a code of symbols for things, objective and subjective Speech, on the other hand, is the act by which the speaker provides with perceptible garments the invisible offspring of his mind." 5)

Holy Scripture, however, requires of us a further distinction. Divine revelation is human language in the form of speech, but with the additional variant of speech reduced to writing. This method of communication has advantages and peculiarities of its own. Scripture expects us to accept its written symbols as speech. To this, many passages bear witness; here we will limit ourselves to two references. Paul introduces a quotation from the Old Testament in Romans 4:3 with the words: τὸ γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ λέγει; "What does Scripture say? Likewise in Rom. 9:17: λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ τῷ Φαραὼ. . . . But while speech vocalized is by nature evanescent and ceases to be of service unless its sound is somehow preserved electronically, language written assumes a permanence which can be impervious to the effects of time or distance. Both in form and in content it remains true to the original purpose of its message. However much language may change with the passing of time, the author may always be understood historically in the code of symbols he employed.

It is indeed well for us that the Godhead chose to communicate with us by means of human language. Those who would assume that the Holy Ghost speaks with men by some other, mystical process in which no form of code other than emotional palpitations are employed and only subjective reactions form the yardstick for truth are not only building their faith on shifting sands but stand in direct contradiction to the

5) Wm. J. Martin in: "Special Revelation as Objective."

Holy Word. The primary cause of Jewish unbelief and rejection of the Savior lay, not in their failure to understand a code of symbols, but in the fact that they refused to open their ears to His speech! This was no mechanical problem in acoustics. Their physical organs of hearing functioned well enough; but "hearing" involves an intellectual comprehension and faithful acceptance of a message. This is suggested also by the usage of the Hebrew equivalent of ἀκούειν. In the Old Testament we have the verb SHAWMA. Its meaning embraces a wider area than that covered by our most common usage of the English term "to hear." It means not only to hear, but also "to understand," (as in the story of Babel, Gen. 11:7, and in the interesting passage 2 Kings 18:26), and sometimes includes the thought of a response. Significantly our Lord required such "hearing" also from those who were limited to written speech. In the story of the rich man and Lazarus he lets Abraham say to Dives concerning the latter's brothers: "They have Moses and the Prophets: let them hear them." (Luke 16:29)

Human language having been chosen by God as the vehicle of communication, He spake unto the Fathers and to us by the prophets and has also spoken unto us by His Son. The message came to the Holy Writers by supraliminal processes; that is, communication with them was not subconsciously received and assimilated, but was heard and understood by them as such, even when the deeper significance of the message lay beyond their full comprehension (1Pet. 1:10-11). It came to them in intelligible and rational speech which they in turn transmitted to posterity by writing, under the controlling guidance of the Holy Spirit (2 Pet. 1:21). The power of language is not creative, and the words of Scripture do not make truth. But they record the truth, and thus are truth. The words themselves are indeed symbols; but they are not symbols of symbols. The concepts which they represent are real, and the events they portray are factual unless God Himself by means of express definition denotes them as parabolic or imaginary. The God of Abraham, Isaak and Jacob is a living Personal Being; the Triune God of the baptismal formula is the active Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier of men and not a mere symbol. The birth, life, suffering, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ were historical events and not mythological representations of psychological phenomena.

The code of symbols which constitutes human language is not, indeed, immediately created by God, but is a product of human devising. Moses writes: "...the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them to Adam to see what he would call them; and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof." (Gen. 2:19). It may safely be assumed that the perfect human mind, capable of inventing word symbols for living creatures, was also able to verbalize the immaterial concepts of human thought, emotion and will. To what extent the language was subsequently supplied by man alone with terminology expressive of values that came into being as a result of sin must remain a moot question; but on the basis of revealed information we can assume that the single human language prevalent before the building of the tower of Babel was of human construction, with the imperfections that would be inherent in such a product.

Yet the Lord God did not create a new language vehicle for His purposes of revelation, In His grace he availed Himself of the human instrument and adapted it to His own use, including the system by which speech is translated in written characters. He adapted the verbalization of humanly recognized concepts to a spoken revelation of Himself and His works, identifying both His manifest and His hidden attributes, as well as those thoughts which He chose to reveal for our good, with the concepts known to man. That this procedure added an anthropomorphic element to the revelation of the transcendent God is of no substantial significance for our present discussion. Even though it be true that essentially the depths of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God remain unplumbed by the mind of man, that His judgments are still unsearchable and His ways past finding out (Rom. 11: 33-34), it was God's unmistakable intention to communicate certain facts and acts to man. This His good and gracious will was unerringly accomplished by the use of human terms with which He made His meaning clear and His saving knowledge attainable. He tells us that His Word is a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path. His statements require no interpretation; for each of them, no more than one primary meaning or sense is admissible. What we do not understand is hidden as a result of our ignorance. The content and meaning of each of the words of His mouth are precise in definition and intelligible to those properly famil-

iar with the language; and where He employs word symbols for concepts unfamiliar to the natural, sinful mind of man, or where He fills them with a content not known on earth, He supplies His own definition by means of other terms which leave no doubt as to His meaning.⁶⁾

Thus Scripture interprets Scripture. In God's mouth, human verbal forms become more than symbols. Transfigured by His gracious, saving power, they are no longer mere reflections of the light of heavenly knowledge, but its sources. When Jesus confessed: "Thy Word is truth," and when He implemented this testimony to the Old Testament by saying, on another occasion: "Thy words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life," (John 6:63, He meant precisely what He said. The λόγοι are symbols which, whether oral or written, individually as well as in their sentence systems represent divinely revealed concepts; and in their sum they constitute ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ. As such, they are spirit and life. At their own peril men pervert them and trifle with their majesty.

This is true of all the inspired Sayings, those of the Law as well as those of the Gospel. Speaking of Moses, Stephen in his sermon to the Sanhedrin declared: "This is he, that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sina, and with our fathers: who received the lively oracles of God (λόγια ζῶντα) of God to give unto us." (Acts 7:38). The reference here is obviously to the divine Law inscribed by God Himself on Sinai and entrusted to Moses. But in Romans 3:2, the Apostle Paul includes more than the Law. His reference is to the entire Old Testament, possession of which is listed as the primary "advantage" (τὸ περισσόν) of the Jews; "...because that unto them were committed τὰ λόγια of God." The most inclusive use of this term is found in Hebrews 5:12: "For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and

6) That what has been said above applies specifically to the autographs of the Scriptural Books as well as to every accurate reproduction of those autographs in any language (as norma normata) need hardly be stated. Certain of the variants, and all interpolations or deletions occurring in subsequent manuscripts through human error, as well as any incorrect translations of the original, are subject to correction and have no appreciable bearing either upon the truth of inspiration or upon the vital conclusions God would have us draw therefrom.

are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat." The exhortation to the Christians who were "dull of hearing" points to their need of being rehearsed in the elementary truths both of the Law and of the Gospel, each in their Old as well as in their New Testament version. These Sayings are the milk, bread and meat of the soul. But they are Sayings fully fixed, verbalized in symbols of language chosen and quickened by God the Holy Ghost.

Therefore Peter addresses us with this fervent admonition: "As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God. If any man speak, let him speak AS THE ORACLES OF GOD" (1 Pet. 4: 11f).

Men sometimes use the idiomatic symbols of revelation to communicate concepts other than those divinely intended. This sacrilege may be perversely committed with fraudulent intent; but perhaps more often it is perpetrated in ignorance, the law of the flesh sitting in judgment upon the inspired Word and forcing it to submit to the sinful will of the intellect.

We too may, by an undue sense of security, be tempted to take liberties with the Word of God which are actually calculated, not to demonstrate the true strength and freedom of our sainthood, but to satisfy a basically fleshly craving for something "new" or "different" - a satisfaction that is sometimes attained at the expense of the Verba Dei. To "speak as the oracles of God" does not, of course, mean to limit our speech as witnesses of the truth to a mere parroting of the words of Scripture. Yet it would be no lesser folly to suggest that as Christians we are free of "forms" and therefore must not allow ourselves to be tied down to fixed verbal formulas for giving expression to sound doctrine. A tendency to disparage dogmatic processes in theology, for example, because they allegedly bind us to stereotyped forms of expression must be opposed. The only binding formulas in a dogmatic approach to the truths of Scripture are, and must remain, the words of Scripture themselves in their context by which they offer us God's own version of the doctrine. To depart from these deliberately when witnessing is in itself a practice suspect. On the other hand, to continue in them with rigid persistence is neither reactionary nor idolatrous, but an act of reverence due the favor of God Who thus once for all delivered the faith unto His saints, and Who has promised that His Word shall not return unto Him void.

Even when the flat taste which comes from constant usage, the ennui that attends upon constant repetition, moves us to depart from the traditional, not inspired forms and formulas of church ceremony on occasion, it behooves us to act with circumspection lest we, by relying upon the inspiration of the moment and the guidance of sanctified Christian judgment, somehow impair the full significance or even abort the divine content of the truths that are connected with every ecclesiastical act worthy of the name. The work of the Office of the Keys is implicit in every true function of Christ's Church. Here we cannot afford to affect a cheerful nonchalance or an uninhibited freedom such as is often appropriate in dealing with pure adiaphora.

The Word of God is sui generis because, although the verbal forms in themselves are human, the content with which God has endowed them in His use is divine. Rob them of this content in the act of witnessing, and they become not merely fraudulent, but devoid of saving power. It is for this reason that we must declare a Baptism performed under Unitarian or other anti-trinitarian auspices not merely doubtful, but of no effect. And a supper of the altar celebrated where the scriptural sense of the words of institution has been publicly repudiated is a meal furnished by man, not the Sacrament of Christ's body and blood.

The limited discussion of the subject here presented, in which but a small number of pertinent Scripture passages could be adduced and the conclusions are stated with great brevity, precludes the thought that exhaustive treatment was attempted. But it is offered in the hope that it will stimulate the reader to further careful study and reflection. For the issues involved lie at the heart of our faith and our labors. We, the privileged witnesses of the grace of God to men, nevertheless continue to bear the image of the earthy; and, as Peter darkly reminds us: "The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away." But our hands and lips of clay hold one instrument of earth that has the seal of immortality. Let us guard it jealously! VERBUM DEI MANET IN AETERNUM.

E. Schaller

PAIDEIA

Controlled Reaction

Honor and shame from no condition rise;
Act well your part, there all the honor lies.

-Pope

The interests of most who read this section of our journal will quite surely include education in its many forms and levels. These same people will also be reading quite regularly the news items and feature articles that report rather sensational new departures, urgent calls to return, and critical evaluations of both the new and old, as well as stirring calls to crash solutions of the crises we are in.

Many situations in our age are crucial: the big cities are nearly overrun with a generation that makes men ask whether the streets will ever be safe again; the pressures of an advanced economy call for brains to run its machinery, which brains are not forthcoming out of the schools we have; complicated political situations cry for men to handle them who are capable; and not least there is the spiritual desert overlying our land in which advisors are not competent to see and grasp the need, nor knowledgeable enough to know the remedy and apply the one thing needful.

In such situations men get tense and thrust and shout. When sputniks soar, schools get the blame for our being behind. When teenagers run wild, schools are criticized. They are usually the scapegoat. One writer calls high school the place where the band practices, cites an instance in which half the space of the school is used for play (physical education and vocational subjects), and complains about there being a natatorium (a pool) for the children. Eminent builders of submarines become experts in education. Principals require several hours of homework where there was none before. Quantity becomes the imagined source of quality. Rigorous requirements are believed to lead to good learning. Out with the slow learners, and our national problems will be solved! Make the tests hard, and we will have a good school.

This is hysterical reaction. It does not even assume that the cause could just possibly lie elsewhere, in society itself. This reaction makes school a tension chamber and a frustration area. It drives children to leave it as school-haters with broken spirits. For there are multitudes there who cannot do what the upper half is able to do--by definition, one half of the total must be below average.

Controlled reaction would rather take the situation as it is and work a way out. The solution is not, to expel the slow and devote teaching to the bright. A rural culture might well absorb the school-leavers and yield them rather happy and successful lives; but our culture is nine-tenths urban. A hundred years ago, even fifty, this was different. Now the unskilled laborers are dumped by the thousands every day upon what has been gruesomely called the human slag heap. Would we want half of America's children turned out of school because they cannot excel, to haunt our alleys and tramp our roads?

There was a time when the cities of industrial England swarmed with terrorizing children, endangering the citizens for one day a week when the factories were closed. There was no pat solution, but men like Robert Raikes collected some interested adults and organized the Sunday schools--not for the teaching of religion, nor in any connection with the churches, but as the solution of a specific social problem.

Another time the children of America went begging for a place to learn. Parents didn't do much about it. A few shopkeepers and craftsmen cleared away a corner and taught a few children what they could as they worked at their trade. A few "dames" took in children for a fee and helped them read and write, so at least the bright ones could go to Latin grammar school (college preparatory). All this was so very bad that a few thinking men set to work upon a solution. They came up with the monitorial school, in which one teacher could supervise the rote learning of hundreds of children in one huge room. So salutary was this arrangement at the time that the governor of New York beamed with pride because they had been given "a gift from Heaven". It was a sensible solution for the moment, and it stands there in history as a great milestone in American education. But it was no final answer. Today we would call it a ridiculous idea, utterly inadequate to help our children along very far in what they need to know. But it was a truly sober solution

just then, for it opened men's eyes to the possibility of school in which one teacher can teach many children, an idea thought impossible at the time.

Controlled reaction implies that we start where we are and work our way out from there. We must get information on how well we are doing. We must discover our weaknesses as well as our strengths. We must ask questions about the health and the homes of the children. The tensions and unhappiness may come largely through our failure to communicate, to make ourselves clear, or to define our goals. We must see our work steadily and we must see it whole--to borrow an expression. We must ask what has changed in the life and culture of our times. If many children think that milk comes from a carton, we must quit making some of our earlier, and justifiable, assumptions.

As educators we must beware of the men with pat solutions, who ignore the state of things as they are, who imagine that one curriculum provides all that children need to know. We must start where we are, and with students as they are, and with schools as they are. We cannot dismiss the children, close the teachers colleges, or burn down the school. To be sure, there are times for drastic action, but those who are balanced will follow the advice of the chef on the preparation of sea food: "First, take your fish."

It has been well said that "individuals who set out diligently in pursuit of what's right will, if they persist at all, soon run out of beaten paths.... They move outside the orbit of 'systems'." Washingtons and Lincolns many a time simply did not know what they would do next. The Christian with his problems does not know what is coming, but he knows his directions. Perplexed he may be, but not in despair. He has not attained, but with St. Paul he "follows after." He must work, he must go forward; the solutions will come in God's good time.

With his feet firmly fixed in a right theology, his reactions to crises in school and life will be thereby controlled. With a steady mind he can take the indicated steps, and never panic.

But this means individual action. Each must be himself. He may check with others, but the decision is his. God uses our names; we are not numbers. To Him we are persons; we must live as individuals. The work of teaching is ours as distinct lives of our own

lives; no trick of the trade has been handed us that works automatically. The sparrows implored Peter Rabbit to exert himself in his extremity; how much more true is not that of us! "Stir up the gift of God, that is in thee," said St. Paul to Timothy, implying that of course he could do the work.

Calm! people, steady!

M. Galstad

Notice

Two essays: "On the Relation of Synod and Local Congregation to the Holy Christian Church," and "Concerning the Ministry of the Keys and the Public Ministry," delivered at the 1962 Convention of the Church of the Lutheran Confession, and published by request of that body, are herewith made available in convenient pamphlet form. They may be ordered from the CLC Book House, Box 145, New Ulm, Minnesota. The price is seventy-five cents per copy.

PREACHING THE WORD

(EDITOR'S NOTE: During the second decade of the century it was the great good fortune of some of us who are now definitely of the older generation to attend the course in Old Testament Exegesis given by Professor August Pieper of the Wisconsin Seminary, then at Wauwatosa, Wisconsin. His studies of the second part of Isaiah were particularly inspiring, and their subsequent publication in book form was most welcome for the opportunity it afforded to recapture particularly the wealth of New Testament thought that is to be found in this Old Testament prophet.

Unfortunately the book is out of print — and it is in German. We understand that Wisconsin Seminary is planning an authoritative translation into English, but as far as we know, no publication date has as yet been announced. If we present a few selected topics in our own translation as prepared for our own seminary students, and if we do this for our "Preaching the Word" department, it is because of the wide scope of the topics chosen, because of the wealth of Gospel thought revealed in these Old Testament concepts, because of the frequency with which they occur elsewhere in Scripture, and because of the way in which a thorough restudy of these concepts will enrich our preaching also on other texts. And finally we do it with the hope that these samples will whet the appetite for the complete Wisconsin translation when it will appear.)

THE "GLORY OF THE LORD." (Isaiah 40:5)

The concept of the K'BHODH Y'HOVAH, Glory of the Lord, is not one to be passed over quickly. Here it is indeed taken in the abstract; but one cannot do full justice to the abstract idea without drawing in that concrete physical phenomenon which was designated by this terminus technicus and by which the Glory of the Lord was symbolized. Maimonides was right in describing it as "splendor quidam creatus, quem Deus quasi prodigii vel miraculi loco ad magnificentiam suam ostendendam altubi habitare fecit," except that with these words he does not present it in its complete form. Scripture sometimes describes it quite briefly, sometimes more at length.

Here we record references to this phenomenon of which we are aware: Ex. 3:2ff; 16:7, 10; 24:16f; 33:22; 40:34ff; Lev. 9:23f; Num. 14:10; 16:19, 42; 20:6; I Chron. 5:14; II Chron. 7:11 (I Kgs. 8:11); Isaiah 6 (cf. Jn. 12:41); Ezekiel 1; 3:23; 8:4; 9:3; 10; 11; 43:2, 4,5;44:4; Lk. 2:9; 9:28ff (cf. II Pt. 1:16); Act. 7:55; Rom. 9:4; Rev. 4; 15:8; 21:11, 23. Cf. also Ps. 18:8ff and 50:1ff. The most complete description is in Ezekiel 1. Revelation differs in some details, probably because the manifestation itself differed in some points.

At its core this manifestation was one of fiery splendor, "like a devouring fire," Ex. 24:17, covered with a vault of heavenly blue, where God was seated in human form upon a throne borne by four winged cherubim. A rainbow marked the outer rim. In its perfection this manifestation symbolized the sum of all the perfections of God. But a few features are here particularly to be noted. The rainbow stands for the goodness and grace of God, Gen. 9:12-17;cf. Rev. 10:1. The vault of heavenly blue where the throne is seen, even as the heaven itself, signifies His royal majesty and His sitting over the cherubim His actual rule over all of creation, Isaiah 37:16; Ps. 99:1. The inner fiery splendor, glowing among the cherubim and radiating from the figure of God throughout the blue of heaven indicates the purity, the holiness, the remoteness of God, cf. especially Dt. 4 and 5. The over-all meaning of this manifestation might be summed up in the one word QADOSH, HOLY. Note the Thrice-Holy of the seraphim in Isaiah 6. Wherever this manifestation appears, its first effect is to cause fear and terror, for it indicates the presence and active intervention of the great and holy God.

But — and this is now to be noted well — the KH'BHODH Y'HOVAH does not signify only the holiness of God. The LORD, the Holy One, He who is a devouring fire, sits in His majesty, enthroned over all the world, surrounded by His rainbow, betokening His grace. This encompasses the heavens, this stands upon the earth, this embraces His entire world-rule. Thus this manifestation becomes a symbol of the grace of the Holy One who by His very nature (an sich) is a consuming fire. Encircled with grace, veiled in grace, He, the Holy One, approaches sinners in order to bless them, rescue them, save them. Also in a historical sense, from its first appearance in the Burning Bush up to the Fields of

Bethlehem, this manifestation is a symbol and firm token (Wahrzeichen) of the grace of a God who comes to redeem His people. But it is just in this grace that God is holy, inviolable, a devouring fire indeed for all who would wantonly misuse it. It is the gracious God who is the One who may not be mocked, Gal. 6:7; Ex. 20:5; 34:7; Num. 14:10; 16:19, 42. The K'BHODH Y'HOVAH is the gracious holiness (Gnadenheiligkeit) or the holy grace of the Lord, a symbol of the Gospel that the Lord sums up in a word: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mk. 16:16. Yes, it is a symbol of the Lord Christ Himself, the Savior of the Lost, the Judge of the unbelieving world. That is how John preaches Him, even as He Himself, and so the disciples proclaim Him. And it is He also in whom this word of Isaiah concerning the revelation of the Glory of the Lord shall find its real fulfillment, Jn. 1:14-18.

(Pieper: Isaiah II, pp 19-20. Tr by E R)

THE HOLY ONE (Isaiah 40:25)

QADOSH! What does that word mean? In ordinary use the term designates everything that is set apart from that which is common, particularly that which is set aside for and consecrated to God. With this higher implication the word takes on the connotation of something that is mysterious, unknown, of something that is super-human and therefore to be treated with reverence and awe. But on this basis the concept is not one that is applied to God, but rather first by God to that which is set apart for Him. Man's awareness of God, his knowledge of God quite naturally precedes his sense of obligation to God, of serving Him and consecrating something to Him. Just so the command to be holy is by revelation based upon the fact that God Himself is holy, Lev. 11:44f; 19:2; etc. The remoteness of God from everything that is not God, the uniqueness of His essence and attributes, that is the basis of this concept.

But this is only the formal aspect. The question is where- in this uniqueness of God consists. And that is found in His absolute perfection, in every respect. Beyond Him there is nothing perfect on earth and in heaven; He alone is perfect,

infinitely exalted above all that there is beside Him. Therefore He is to be worshipped by all that are imperfect, to be honored and revered by them. But although this concept includes all the perfections of God, therefore also His absolute power and wisdom, yet it is not for their sake that God is "holy." QADOSH is an ethical concept. It indicates God's ethical perfection, in contrast to all ethical imperfection outside of Him, and this now in every direction. Over against all darkness God is Light. And that not only as a quiescent attribute, within Himself and for Himself, but as energy and action over against that which is sinful, unclean, dark. The light shines into the darkness, consumes it, but at the same time creates life and joy. The holiness of God is that side of His person by which He abolishes the existing sinfulness, uncleanness, darkness (=misfortune and doom) and replaces them with life and salvation. That is why it manifests itself on the one hand in wrath, punishment and judgment, working ruin, death and damnation; and on the other in mercy, salvation and true happiness, working atonement and reconciliation with God, holiness, and a life of blessedness.

The holiness of God is therefore not only (as it is quite generally understood, though in too restricted a sense) that ethical quality according to which He hates sin and plunges the sinner into death and ruin. It is also the principle of all goodness, love, benefit, of every blessing and salvation. In addition to a hundred other passages this is shown above all by Isaiah 6. There the QADOSH is repeated three times. The same holiness which terrified the sinful prophet to the point where he feels himself undone takes his sin from him and unites him with God. It was the same at the calling of Peter. Before him in the ship stood "the Holy One of God." His presence fills him with trembling, and yet at the same time makes him an absolved servant, filled with the Spirit.

The holiness of God is the same as the glory of the Lord. The latter is only something that gives it outward form and a name (nur deren auessere Darstellung und Benennung). At the calling of Moses, Ex. 3, the Burning Bush at the same time expressed the "noli me tangere," and provided a pledge for the redemption of Israel. In Ex. 34:6-7 the Lord Himself proclaims His name, i. e. His glory, and that is His infinite grace and His consuming wrath. That is the glory that He will not give to another, Isaiah 42:8, namely that He will not break the bruised reed (v. 3) — yet in His wrath cry out like a tra-

vailing woman, and destroy all. Cf. ch. 57:15 and Lk. 1:49-55. This is what supplies the real meaning for the O. T. expression, "The Holy One of Israel," (about 30 times in Isaiah) and the N. T. term, "the Holy One of God" (Mk. 1:24; Lk. 4:34).

This holiness is the entire ethical side of God, His "virtus," and as such the basic principle of all that He does: His creation and preservation of this world, but particularly the things done in the course of the history of salvation. Whatever, apart from God, is called "holy" in Scripture is holy because in some way it is connected with this holy God. —The Lord is QADOSH: He who alone is the great HOLY One in an absolutely inviolable saving faithfulness toward His chosen people and in unquenchable enmity toward His and their foes unfailingly works out the salvation of Israel and the destruction of their foes, by virtue of His all-excelling wisdom and power. How can, how dare Israel even for a moment fearfully and doubtfully compare Him with men, nations, idols, earthly sovereigns?

(Pieper, Isaiah II, pp 66-67. Tr by E R)

P A N O R A M A

THE VOICE Some time ago by courtesy of President
.....THE HANDS Oscar Naumann of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod we received a copy of the answer of that Synod to an invitation which they had received over the signature of the three major Lutheran bodies in America, The American Lutheran Church, The Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod, and the Lutheran Church in America. The purpose of their letter was to invite Wisconsin to take part in "a series of meetings, which purpose to explore the possibility and desirability of establishing a new association of Lutheran Churches in the USA to replace or succeed the National Lutheran Council." In its answer Wisconsin did not simply decline, but took time to set forth its confessional position on this subject and the reason for declining to take part. In this connection the letter restated the old Synodical Conference principle, "to strive for true unity of doctrine and practice among Lutheran church bodies," and then goes on to say:

"In the various instances during the recent decades when Lutheran bodies outside our fellowship have addressed invitations to the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod to participate in intersynodical discussions, our Synod has therefore expressed a willingness and a desire to participate in such discussions if their actual purpose was that of striving for full unity in doctrine and practice. On these occasions we have, however, expressed the Scripture-based conviction that such discussions can serve this objective only under the following conditions: 1) if differences in doctrine and practice which separate the various Lutheran bodies are frankly acknowledged; 2) if it is made the prime business of such discussions to remove the existing barriers by honestly facing the points of difference, with the intention of establishing the true doctrine and practice on the basis of Scripture and of rejecting the opposing error and unscriptural practice; 3) if until actual unity has been achieved all practice of church

fellowship, all forms of joint worship and all joint Church work, is conscientiously avoided."

Such a statement is not easy to make, nor is it a small matter to hold and maintain such a position. To do so marks such a church body as standing stiffly apart from the modern scene, bringing down upon its head the charge of resisting the new spirit of mutual understanding and cooperation that has already done so much to bring formerly divided Lutherans together. It is particularly hard to do so when the meetings in question were just to be "preliminary consultations," the purpose of which should be merely "to explore the possibility and desirability of establishing a new association." But the wisdom of Wisconsin's action was demonstrated when a bare two months after the meetings which were to explore "possibility and desirability," the NLC News Bureau proudly announced the ratification of an agreement whereby the American Lutheran Church in America, and the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod will end the system by which Missouri as well as the other groups tried to provide their own contact pastors to serve the military personnel at the various armed forces installations. One man, be he ALC or LCA or Missouri, is to serve all Lutherans alike. The conventions of the respective church bodies (which at least as far as Missouri is concerned were to be consulted) have thus been committed by their committees, which have created a situation which the "Northwestern Lutheran" aptly compares with the announcement of an engagement, heralding a marriage soon to follow. We congratulate Wisconsin on its strongly dissenting stand.

We wish we could stop here. But, as we see it, we have the duty of presenting the entire picture, not merely the bright side. And when we do that, we find it hard to reconcile the firmness and soundness of the action we have just described above with the rather ostentatious display of togetherness in the celebration of the thirty-fifth anniversary of joint religious broadcasting by Missouri and Wisconsin over Stations WTMJ and WTMJ-TV, Milwaukee. Coming at approximately the same time when Wisconsin's Praesidium wrote that splendid answer to the pan-Lutheran invitation, and coming some eighteen months after Wisconsin's suspension of fellowship with Missouri, this action could not but cause confusion, cause men everywhere to ask, Just where does Wisconsin stand? It is

true that this anniversary was in no way sponsored by the Synod or its Administration. Even as the broadcasts, so also the celebration was sponsored by a local and "unofficial" conference, The Lutheran Radio Conference of Milwaukee. It was they who arranged the nicely balanced program: two services, one radio and one TV, with a Wisconsin pastor as liturgist and a Missourian as preacher in the one, and with the same pattern in the second service, except that there the two roles were reversed. It was this Joint Radio Conference that reaped a rich harvest of publicity, ten times what was given the sober action of the Wisconsin Administration. This is what is compounding the confusion that is already too great. Unless the "official" voice of Wisconsin will make itself heard widely also on this issue, not only those who enjoy criticizing Wisconsin, but also those who sincerely support the principles that it expressed so well in the matter referred to before, will be faced with an inscrutable problem over this discrepancy between words and actions and will have to say with perplexed and troubled old Isaac: "The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau."

E. Reim

OUR
SCIENTIFIC
AGE

This is being written at a time when many minds are turning to the deadline for income tax returns. After hours of calculation, the final figures come to view and the exhausted tax-payer sits back and considers what the billions of dollars of tax money are being spent for. He cannot help knowing that a large portion is being allocated for the perfecting of nuclear weapons, guided missiles, space capsules, etc. In the field of science one world power is madly racing to outdo the other. The element of fear provides the propelling force as scientists work around the clock and skilled workmen carry out their plans trying to keep things moving on a tight time schedule. Meanwhile diplomats the world over are watching each other like hawks lest one should get undue advantage of the other in the explorations of science and so upset carefully laid plans. It would seem that the vast majority is looking to science for an answer to the problems that face the world and not even the sky is the limit when the

expense is considered. By and large, science has become man's god and into the maw of this huge idol go the fruits of men's hands.

This glorification of science is discernible not only in the secular sphere but evidence is at hand to show how men who have been called to spiritual leadership are being swept into the maelstrom. Instead of providing sound scriptural guidance in these critical times, they are trimming their sails to conform to the course that our scientific age is charting. Under the banner of historical science and historical-critical methods of research, old doctrines are being laid aside while concessions are made to present-day scientific theories. Into the discard go, for instance, the first chapters of Genesis, the books of Jonah and Job, as doubt is cast upon the historicity of the events there recorded. The Scriptures are put through a demythologizing process in order to get at the message. Portions that have seemed to conflict with science are put under the microscope and soon it is announced that they are cast in poetic form and therefore not to be taken literally.

To illustrate what has been happening we call attention to the advance that the "new" approach to the Scriptures has made, for instance, in The American Lutheran Church. This development has not gone unnoticed nor has it gone unchallenged. As a result of objections raised by the rank and file, a special meeting of theological professors and district presidents was called last summer. Especially the theological professors were called because the "new" approach had been noticed in the work of interns from the seminary and in the ministry of the younger graduates. The interpretation of the first eleven chapters of Genesis and the books of Job and Jonah was involved. As an example of the thinking that prevailed in this meeting the following paragraph of an editorial in The Lutheran Standard of July 31, 1962, is here given: "The professor then outlined three of the points involved in the human factor in the Bible, namely its linguistic forms, its literary forms, and its thought forms. To cite a single example of how the linguistic side of the Scriptures, the words it uses, affects biblical interpretation, take the current turmoil over the word "adam" in the first chapters of Genesis. In Hebrew this is the generic word for 'mankind' (German: der Mensch), not the word for man as an individual. There are, Dr. Milton said, indications (sic) in the first three chapters of Genesis that an individual is involved, but if you want to interpret the Bible

honestly you must begin with the fact that the Hebrew word adam means mankind. To refuse to recognize this linguistic fact is to be guilty of what the United Testimony calls a 'rationalizing process which would explain away...the human factor in the Bible.'"

It is quite evident that these observations were made in order to calm the storm that had arisen over the "new" approach to the first chapters of Genesis. The untiring crusade of the evolutionists has had its effect and the old barriers are being torn down under the cover of a new found "scholarship" that has crossed the ocean. For we are told that this "new" approach is not new to Lutherans in Europe. It is hoped that the objections being raised in TALC will not subside even though its official magazine called the meeting in July "A Fruitful Meeting."

The Journal of Theology has, on other occasions, called attention to the sad concessions made to modern theological approaches by certain teachers within the Synodical Conference. The situation there has not improved as is revealed by the documentations in connection with recent withdrawals from the Missouri Synod by pastors and congregations who have for years been vainly trying to stem the tide but have now come to the conclusion that the new approach to Scripture will not be purged from Missouri. Surely there can be little hope that Missouri will turn back so long as the Statementarians continue to have their way.

In the midst of changes that are frankly admitted by science-conscious protestants, how has the Roman Catholic Church fared? With its rigid control by the hierarchy one might think that here there would be no chance for ferment. But Rome has been infected too. An anonymous European observer makes this observation: "A decade ago quite narrow limits were set for Roman Catholic exegetes. They could not make, without careful qualification, certain affirmations which have long been a common possession in Protestant theology. Take, for example, the realization that quite a few biblical texts must not be accepted unconditionally as historical reports, but are primarily to be understood as witness, and that, therefore, the historicity of the events related in the Bible cannot in every case be guaranteed. Or take the finding that some writings, even though they have been handed down under the name of a single author, in reality present a collection of texts which grew together into a totality in the course of a long literary

history. Or again, and especially, take that important rule of the scientific method which requires that one ask in regard to every single text: To which literary form does it belong, and what is its original Sitz im Leben? Application of this rule has contributed greatly to an understanding of the original force and vividness of many texts. For a long time Roman Catholic exegetes were obliged to exercise the greatest reserve in using these historical-critical methods of research. This has changed. Today we can often tell only by the Imprimatur whether a scientific publication dealing with Scripture stems from a Roman Catholic or a Protestant source." (Christian Century Nov. 28, 1962. p. 1449.) In a desire to create an image that will be conducive to ecumenicity and favorable to dialogues with Protestant churches many Roman Catholic exegetes have breasted the opposition of the curia and have followed in the footsteps of their science-obsessed "separated" brethren. It is no credit to the Protestants that they have led the way in the concessions that are being made to the votaries of science.

The ultimate was reached by the Rev. Andrew Morton who this month will be publishing his findings in a volume of New Testament studies which will present evidence from an electronic computer operated by the University of London. By feeding every sentence in the Epistles to the computer for the purpose of counting the kais, Morton has come to the conclusion that only four epistles were written by the apostle Paul. According to this 'kairopractice' the other ten epistles came from at least three other hands. Morton says that this will be a hard blow to all kinds of Fundamentalists who take the Bible literally. However, in an attempt to soften the blow he says that his study "in no way detracts from the Epistles' value as church scripture." He, of course, overlooks the fact that his "kairopractice" makes forgeries out of the Pauline epistles which he now attributes to other writers. The poor man did have to start out with the assumption that Galatians was written by Paul, since he did have to have a pattern according to which the other epistles could be tested. At this point a Scripture passage comes to mind: "He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision. Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure." Ps. 2:4-5.

C. M. G.

A LOOK AT THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL

The Second Vatican Council recessed in December and will not reconvene until September. It is rather significant to note that non-Catholic observ-

ers were quick to express their favorable impressions of the proceedings. In fact the press was flooded with such reports before the meeting had scarcely gotten under way. The drive for "ecumenicity" is so strong that men see things they want to see before any action is taken to provide a basis for judgment. On the other hand it is quite apparent that Catholic representatives are very cautious in making any appraisal of the Council. It was not until March 9th that America, a Jesuit publication, attempted an appraisal which it called "Early Appraisal." In these reflections from Rome, it was carefully stated that no conciliar decrees were given to the Church and to the world but that the process which had been set in motion was only an educative one. Fr. Murphy declares: "The conciliar debate immediately established the existence of a keen sense of absolute agreement on the essentials of the faith and on the loyalty of all the prelates to the Holy See in the person of the Supreme Pontiff." However, an attempt is made to represent the Council as a forum that provides opportunity for free speech. To project this image upon the screen of world opinion was of major importance to the Pope who wanted to create the impression that the thought and the action of his subjects are not controlled as they are in the modern totalitarian states. If Protestant observers were to be moved to relax their guard and to be sent out from the Council as ambassadors of good will this was a road block that needed to be removed. Fr. Murphy says: "What seemed to please the Holy Father immensely, however, was the attention the Council received from the outside world. There is now hardly a section of the globe where the reading public does not realize that there is room for freedom of conscience within the Catholic Church. It was this liberty that first impressed the non-Catholic observers who were given such favorable treatment at the Council." Anyone who is acquainted with Roman theology and practice knows that the only freedom found in Rome is the freedom that the Pope allows and beyond this it does not extend. The organization and the power of organization is just as compact as it ever has been.

Much time was spent on the matter of liturgical robes and the use of the vernacular in the order of the mass. Here the image of freedom was cast and observers were quick to send home their favorable impressions of Rome's "new" look. One could well say that at this point the observers were put to sleep and whatever else came up was a dream from which there will be a rude awakening when some day it becomes apparent to them that Rome has not changed but is ever the same. It is only with the spirit of the Lord's mouth that the Man of Sin will be consumed and it is with the brightness of the Lord's coming that he shall be destroyed. II Thess. 2:8. Those who have closed their eyes to Second Thessalonians chapter two are held in a strong delusion that they should believe a lie. To give freedom in the use of less ornate and more contemporary robes and to grant the use of the vernacular in the liturgy is only a sop. It is similar to the dispensations given to those who are excused on occasion from observance of the commandments regarding the eating of meats. The hierarchy lays down laws and then makes the people feel good by relaxing them when it is convenient so to do.

C. M. G.

SACRED SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION. One of the areas in which there was a threat of conflict in Vatican II was the one pertaining to the relationship between Scripture and tradition. The more liberal Catholics realized that this was a delicate issue and that some non-Catholic observers might be alienated if the wrong words were spoken. Members of the Curia were not so reserved but made their influence felt in the first draft that came before the Council. It bore the title De Duobus fontibus revelationis ("On the two sources of revelation"). It was at once recognized by the Secretariat for Unity that this title and the whole schema on revelation that followed would raise a road block in the way for those who were seeking to bring the separated "brethren" back to "Mother" church. The Pope saw this too and broke his silence by intervening. He first sought a compromise by remanding the schema to a committee made up of members of the Theological Commission and the Secretariat of Unity. But when this failed to bring about the desired results he intervened for

the second time by creating a new commission under the chairmanship of the papal Secretary of State with little consideration being given to the so-called conservative side. The new commission is to reduce the 70 schemata to a "manageable" 20 and care is to be taken that they are irenic in tone. With other words care is to be taken so that the relation between Scripture and tradition will be so presented that it will be possible to demonstrate that Catholics and Protestants may find a common ground. This method of resolving an impasse has a familiar ring to it.

Just what is the issue regarding the nature of revelation? The point at issue among the Catholic theologians today may be expressed thus: "Are Sacred Scripture and Tradition two distinct founts, each containing separate doctrines? Or are they rather, two ways or modes by which one single, unique revelation comes down to us?" The ecumenical minded members of the hierarchy are using all their political ingenuity to swing the Commission's formulation in the direction of the latter. Eventually they will say that there is no difference and in effect there is none. Fr. Dulles, one of their authorities on ecumenical questions, puts it this way: "The more recent theological opinion on the relation between Scripture and Tradition, which would regard them as two aspects of a single source, rather than as two separate deposits, has made it possible for Catholics to find a meeting ground with Protestants. They can agree with Protestants that in some genuine sense all revelation is contained in Scripture, while insisting at the same time that Scripture never discloses its full meaning unless read in the atmosphere of authentic tradition." These are weasel words and are intended to be an answer to those who will at once bring up the Roman doctrines of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption of the Virgin Mary. How indeed can the ecumenists prove that these are revealed in Scripture? If their formulation prevails they will say that while these doctrines are not explicitly and literally taught in Scripture they are nevertheless found there in a deeper sense which is finally discerned by the church as she prays and ponders on the Word and considers them in the light of tradition. This is a smooth approach and will throw the unwary off their guard and cause them to say that Rome has retracted its false doctrine on the nature of revelation.

But what of the Council of Trent and its decrees? Already the way is being prepared for a new interpretation of its propositions. Here is what the Jesuit Robert A. Graham says: "Recent studies of debates at the Council of Trent have suggested that it was not the mind of that Council to imply that Scripture and Tradition are as entirely separate as has been commonly understood. Scripture scholars are particularly anxious that no decision be taken by the Council which would bar new interpretations of the decree of Trent before adequate study." The Jesuit Graham is no doubt drawing on records of the debate at Trent concerning the original proposal presented for discussion on "Decretum De Canonicis Scripturis." This is the wording of the original proposal concerning the relation of Scripture and Tradition: "The Church has transmitted this Revelation to us partly (partim) out of the Scriptures which are in the Old and the New Testament, partly (partim) also out of a simple transmission by hand." (quoted by G. H. Tavard in "Holy Writ or Holy Church" p. 196). Because of the persistent objections of a minority at Trent the partly-partly reading was replaced by "and". This was manifestly a move to oppose in one stroke the *sola scriptura* principle of the Reformation on the one hand and to satisfy those in their own midst who were unwilling to exalt tradition above Scripture on the other.

In the light of this interpretation of the Council of Trent attempts are also now being made to picture Martin Chemnitz as one who was influenced in his Examen by "allegedly mistaken post-Trentine theologians." (Dialog, Vol. 2. Winter 1963 p. 61). Thus the testimony of Martin Chemnitz is being downgraded and he is made to appear as one who did not take into account the background of the decrees of the Council. The pertinent section from Chemnitz's Examen is found in the edition of Ed. Preuss on page 5 and is here given in the German rendition of R. Bendixen: Welche Hilfsmittel hat sich aber die Tridentinische Synode zur Feststellung der Glaubenssaetze erkoren? Etwa die Lehre des Heiligen Geistes, die, nach Hieronymus, in den kanonischen Schriften vorgetragen ist? Keineswegs, erklären Jene, soll die Schrift die einzige Regel und Richtschnur unseres Urteils sein, sondern das ist Ihr erster Irrtum, dass sie die ungeschriebenen Ueberlieferungen mit gleicher Ehrfurcht wie die Schrift selbst behandelt wissen wollen." Because the new interpretation of Trent will no doubt be very much in evidence during the remainder of the Council sessions and because Martin Chemnitz has now been accused of

being influenced in his Examen by allegedly mistaken post-Tridentine theologians, it will be necessary to take a look at the specific decree of Trent that is involved and see if Martin Chemnitz was indeed wrong in his evaluation.

The Decree concerning the Canonical Scriptures adopted in the Fourth Session held April 8, 1546 is given in Schaff's "Creeds of Christendom" Vol. II p. 79ff. and reads: "The sacred and holy, ecumenical and general Synod of Trent -- lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, the same three legates of the Apostolic See presiding therein--keeping this always in view, that, errors being removed, the purity itself of the Gospel be preserved in the Church: which (Gospel) before promised through the prophets in the holy Scriptures, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, first promulgated with His own mouth, and then commanded to be preached by His apostles to every creature, as the fountain of all, both saving truth and moral discipline; and seeing clearly that this truth and discipline are contained in the written books, and the unwritten traditions which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself, or from the Apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand: (The Synod) following the examples of the orthodox fathers, receives and venerates with an equal affection of piety and reverence, all the books both of the Old and of the New Testament--seeing that one God is the Author of both--as also the said traditions, as well those appertaining to faith as to morals, as having been dictated, either by Christ's own word of mouth or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuing succession... But if any one receive not, as sacred and canonical, the said books entire with all their parts, as they have been used to be read in the Catholic Church, and as they are contained in the old Latin vulgate edition; and knowingly and deliberately condemn the traditions aforesaid; let him be anathema." Let him who will,, judge whether or not Chemnitz erred in his condemnation of Trent. Let him who will, judge whether or not the Roman Church finally looks to the canonical Scriptures as the only source and norm of doctrine. No amount of argumentation will succeed in proving that the Roman Church looks to one source of revelation as the basis of the doctrines that it teaches. Such doctrines as those of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption of the Virgin Mary are found only in tradition and not in Scripture. The words Jesus addressed to the Pharisees apply

equally well to the papists: "In vain they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Matt. 15:9. Martin Chemnitz in his Examen says: "Unzweifelhaft stammt die Luegenkette in den Traditionen der Talmudisten and Paepstler von dem einen Raenkeschmiede, der Unkraut unter den guten Samen gestreut hat."

C. M. G.

CONTENTS

VOLUME III

April 1963

NUMBER 2

WORDS AND THE WORD.	1
E. Schaller	

PAIDEIA

CONTROLLED REACTION.	12
M. Galstad	

PREACHING THE WORD

THE GLORY OF THE LORD.	16
Pieper — Reim	

THE HOLY ONE.	18
Pieper — Reim	

PANORAMA

THE VOICE.....THE HANDS.	21
E. Reim	

OUR SCIENTIFIC AGE.	23
C. M. Gullerud	

A LOOK AT THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL.	27
C. M. Gullerud	

SACRED SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION.	28
C. M. Gullerud	

NOTICE OF ESSAYS ON CHURCH AND MINISTRY.	15
--	----

THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY (Church of the Lutheran Confession) is published at New Ulm, Minnesota, by authorization of the Church of the Lutheran Confession. Subscriptions are payable in advance at the CLC BOOK HOUSE, Box 145, New Ulm, Minnesota. The rate is \$3.00 per year for five issues: February, April, June, October, December. All correspondence other than subscriptions or changes of address should be addressed to Prof. E. Reim, Editor, Route 22, Eau Claire, Wisconsin. The Editorial Committee: E. Reim, Chairman; C. M. Gullerud; E. Schaller; M. Galstad.