



"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

VOLUME 5

MAY, 1965

NUMBER 2

THE IMPACT OF THE REFORMATION ON THE CULTURE OF GERMANY

Translated from the
KIRCHENGESCHICHTE
of Prof. John P. Koehler by E. Reim

EDITOR'S NOTE: The following is a translation in full of two chapters in Koehler's KIRCHENGESCHICHTE prepared for the use of our Seminary students in a course which otherwise consists of condensed notes from the original German. Since much of the material is of general interest, it is published here for the benefit of our readers.

The course of the Church's history is determined not merely by the motives that underlie a given religious movement. Even among those who represent that movement there are spiritual and worldly considerations, things divine and things that are human, all going along side by side. This is even more evident when one takes a comprehensive view of a specific movement in the church. To an even greater degree the influence which this has on the culture of the age depends on particular interests that originally did not even pertain to that movement. If ever, therefore, it is necessary at this point to distinguish between Luther, the Reformation, and the culture of the Germany of the 16th century.

The Person of Luther

The last years of Luther's life were lived under the shadow of illness and grave disappointments. His illness (kidney stones) made him irritable, and the course of the Reformation did not serve to cheer him. Melanchthon's ways caused him no end of trouble by playing into the hands of Philip of Hesse and Butzer with their diplomacy, providing many a Catholic schemer with an opportunity to practice a little intrigue of his own. An added point was that, contrary to Luther's entire way of thinking, considerations of secular policies and politics were becoming so interwoven with the work of the Reformation that an individual person could hardly follow a course of his own without stepping entirely out of the area of active participation in the work. Luther had lost confidence in the people, in the Princes, and also in the leaders of the church. This was not a mood of pessimism but was rather based on an accurate evaluation of the circumstances in which he found himself. Thus it was sometimes hard for him to bear the various reverses with equanimity and confident trust in God, particularly since the earlier stages of the Reformation had been marked with such vigorous progress. That Luther was not always able to maintain a cheerful spirit has given his adversaries an opportunity to cast their invidious reflections on him and his stand.

That is why it is in place at this point to sum up the chief features in the image of the Reformer. This is no simple matter, indeed, if one wishes to do justice to this powerful personality without idealizing it. Even his contemporaries, and much more so the men of a later day, have invariably according to their own particular ideals arrived at one-sided judgments. "Orthodoxy saw him as the one who restored the right doctrine; Pietism saw him as the hero of prayer and faith; the Enlightenment as the pioneer of reason and opponent of superstition, even as the era of the Freedom-fighters saw him as the hero of German nationalism, etc." He has been compared with Melanchthon,

Zwingli and Calvin, and according to their particular preferences men have with reference to specific individual aspects either overrated or underestimated him. Beginning with John Cochlaeus and continuing down to Janssen, Denifle, Grisar and others, his opponents have reviled him, sometimes in a most obscene manner. But this very fact enables one to recognize that here we have the most important figure of history since the days of the Apostles, one to which one can simply not remain indifferent.

Luther was indeed what his adherents of various eras have claimed and for which they have praised him in their rather one-sided manner, but he himself was anything but one-sided. He differed from Melanchthon, Zwingli and Calvin because he did not have that unilateral interest that prevailed among them. It has been said that Luther knew nothing of scholarly form and method, that he was neither a dogmatician nor an exegete. But if one understands dogmatics to mean that one perceives the various doctrines of Scripture in their inner connection as well as with regard to the careful line of demarcation that exists between them, and that one presents them in the same careful manner, then Luther was the greatest dogmatician of them all. He did not indeed have the particular interest that his contemporaries had, namely the scholastic interest which overemphasizes the intellectual side of any particular question. Furthermore, he was an outspoken opponent of the philosophical method of systematizing—and that was just where his particular strength lay. It is a mistake to think that the clarity of doctrinal concepts gained anything from the dogmatical method that was subsequently in such general vogue. Actually the concepts were diminished thereby, as is invariably the case where intellectualism prevails.

The same is true of exegesis. If one takes this term to mean that one recognizes the language of the Scriptures as normal human speech which God has taken into His service with all its inherent peculiarities of origin and expression, as well as of comprehension on the part of the hearer or read-

er; if one understands that He has done this in order to reveal His super-mundane Gospel here on earth; if one keeps in mind that therefore this language of the Scriptures must, as to its form, in every respect be taken and understood in the same manner as other speech and tongue; if one sees that with sensitive perceptivity we must follow the thought of the sacred writer in order to observe how for him the form and expression came to be just what it is in the text that lies before us (excepting only that we approach and treat this text with the faith that is wrought by the Gospel itself, namely that this is indeed the Word of God)--- then Luther was the greatest exegete of them all. To present his thoughts in concise form as did Melancthon and Calvin, for this Luther was granted neither the time nor the opportunity. But that he could be concise, of that his Small Catechism furnishes convincing proof. But on the other hand he also knew that scientific form and method, taken by themselves, are not enough.

It is said that Luther was no o r g a n i z e r as Zwingli was, or Calvin. But if one understands that the term organization implies also this that out of the thoughts that constitute the Gospel there were produced the forms which in the society of his day made for an orderly, yet perfectly free course for the Gospel, then Luther was the greatest organizer of them all. And he did make use of this gift. But he was not a contriver, one who for the sake of expediency would by law and regulation create one-sided forms, forms which, however, would become hindrances for true evangelical freedom.

Luther was a plain, simple Christian. That is what he had become by the Gospel that had worked in him, and his entire work reveals this same quality. What a simple Christian believes and how he comes to believe it, that is something that Luther, having first learned it from the Gospel, now studied and restudied with all the scholarly aids of that day. And the result of this intensive labor of mind and soul was simply what the Holy Spirit had already

wrought in him, the simple faith (das einfaeltige Christentum) of a child. Nor did it ever become anything else. This is what is greatest in Luther. This was his strength with the people. This was the source of the powerful influence of this great personality. Therein lies the significance of the intellectual labors of this man whom experience had so thoroughly matured. This made for the truthful sincerity that marks the entire activity of this so eminently practical man, an activity which had but a single interest, the saving of souls: a goal toward which this man could contribute nothing out of himself, for which he could invent nothing, could not systematize, could not organize anything by himself, for which he desired only that the Gospel might be given free course. Simple though this is, yet it is something found so rarely among those who are called to work at the high levels of leadership. But that Luther was such a person, that is what makes him "a great man," and at the same time one who like no one else was a true disciple of Paul.

But even so, he was a man like other men. It is wrong to saddle him with an indictment for his crudities. But it is likewise a mistake to idealize or perhaps even imitate these features. It is a matter of learning to know and to understand those times, and Luther, the man who lived in those times. Then one will understand that many of the disappointments and reverses that beset the Reformation must be ascribed not only to Luther's co-workers but in part to Luther himself.

There is a question whether Luther's advice to Lambert in connection with the organizing of the Church in Hesse was sound. But at the same time it is wrong to charge Luther with inconsistency because in the case of Saxony he had spoken of the Princes as temporary, emergency bishops (Not-bischoefe) after having previously in the case of the Bohemians emphasized their spiritual priesthood. Luther's yielding in the case of the Wittenberg Concord is undoubtedly to be attributed to the exigencies of the situation rather

than to Luther's real attitude, while the attitude of Butzer and Melanchthon which adapted itself to the wishes of the Princes here carried the day. It would also seem that Luther's counsel regarding the bigamous marriage of Philip of Hesse was the result of the pressure of the outward circumstances rather than simply out of the merits of the case itself. As to the Smalcaldic League, Luther's position was the only correct one. He represented the conscience of his times in the matter of obedience to the Imperial government. At the same time he left the decision in this secular matter in the hands of the political counsellors of the Princes and committed the entire matter to God. Only by thus evaluating Luther just as any other man, does it become possible to demonstrate just which the issues are where almost alone among the men of his day, Luther was right. Only thus does one come to understand Luther's basic ideas in these matters, namely that whatever was done right is to be attributed solely to the grace of God and the power of the Gospel.

The Reformation

The name given this period links it together with earlier medieval reform movements, and so there are many who emphasize the thought that the Reformation is still a part of the Middle Ages. The incorrectness of this view appears as soon as one comes to the real thoughts of Luther, thoughts which also were received quite correctly by his adherents and particularly by the common people. The issue turned about the very heart of religion, the forgiveness of sins. Luther took this concept just as it is given in Scripture, even as it has ever and again been taken by the common Christian in its essence, and as it was then presented in further detail in Luther's teachings.

By faith a Christian is assured of the forgiveness of his sins by the blood of Christ. Even though he may become conscious of it only by degrees, this involves, *eo ipso* an unqualified trusting in God and in His grace in every respect, and thus also in His Word (verbal inspiration,

rightly understood!). Confidently one attributes this grace to the God of eternity, even before the foundations of the earth were laid—relying on this grace for the assurance that thereby our salvation is made secure even unto eternity. This faith is not merely that one accepts the doctrine of a church as true, but rather a miraculous experience wrought by the Holy Spirit by means of the Gospel. With this faith is given a life of sanctification, a life which seeks to be guided by the Word of God. This sanctification consists in an affirmative testimony (*Bewaehrung*) of the justifying grace of God. Since the Fall of Adam this world is in a state of corruption. Under these conditions the role of the Christian is simply to do the work of his calling and to keep himself unspotted from the world. No created thing is sinful in itself. It is an *adiaphoron*. But monastic withdrawal from the world is, as a matter of ascetic discipline, a morbidly unsound thing in any case. For example, fasting can come into consideration only as a matter of outward training or custom. But the sin which injects itself into every phase of life, not only into the life of the state or the community, but also of the church, even into the personal practice of the Christian life by the individual believer (original sin!), all this is something the Christian earnestly attacks, in expectation of the Glory of the Lord's Return.

In two different respects Luther has been faulted for this view of life (*Weltauffassung*) but without reason. Generally it is said that thereby Luther in certain respects still remained a child of the Middle Ages. That would be said with reference to his pessimistic view of the world, his concept of asceticism and his stand on Scripture (verbal inspiration, the "Paper Pope"). But comparing the outline given above with the corresponding presentations of the Middle Ages will reveal that these respective articles of Luther's doctrine are not to be found in the Middle Ages, at least not in that form, but that these articles were drawn directly from the Scriptures.

On the other hand there is an equal impropriety in the fact that Luther has been praised by some for taking a more

liberal attitude toward the canon of the Bible and the doctrine of inspiration that was the case with his later followers. The same observation is made in regard to his interpretation of Scripture as compared with theirs. That he did not go farther in this direction is then laid to the fact that his age was still deficient in knowledge concerning the origin of the New Testament and its canon. This subjective judgment has its basis in a specific attitude towards Scripture itself, an attitude which, however, cannot be found in Luther. If one wishes to understand Luther aright and thus gauge correctly his position and his importance, both in the world and in the Church, then one must take the same position toward Scripture as did Luther. Only then will one arrive at a true evaluation of Luther and his era.

That Luther and his contemporaries were in many outward matters still bound by medieval concepts is self-evident and calls for no further elaboration in view of the processes of historical development (note Melancthon's interest in astrology also the witch trials of the 17th century).

The work of Luther therefore was the Reformation of the Church, a renewing of original Christianity, not of the Empire Church but of the Church of the Apostles: a rediscovery of the Gospel (hence the name "Evangelicals"). Very properly therefore Luther considered the Romanists to be the apostates. The reason why Luther's estimate of the Empire Church is different from what has been presented in the first part of this book is the fact that for him there was no particular occasion for making an accurate analysis of those things. Furthermore, the Lutheran Church would have to pass through its own stages of development before one could arrive at such comparisons as then afford a deeper insight into the entire history. But what Luther did find in the Ancient Church is something that he recognized also in certain specific episodes in the Middle Ages, even as it is a fact that Luther's ideas are simply the basic ideas of the Gospel which are met in every era and which, in

spite of all other differences, are always found, at least in the deeply felt emotions of their faith, in those who call Jesus their Lord.

II

Since De Wette, Twesten and Dorner a frequently recurring view appears in the historical works of these times. This view holds that over against the principle of tradition as it was held by the Church of Rome the Reformation elevated Scripture to the level of a principle, and that the Lutheran Church gave greater emphasis to the material principle (the doctrine of justification), while Calvinism stressed the formal principle (the authority of Scripture). Lutheranism is then said to have observed the proper middle course between these two extremes, also in all subsequent developments. All this is meant well, but since the terms are by no means well chosen, it can be gravely misunderstood.

The technical terms have a philosophical background, and so lend themselves to Melanchthon's later concepts of doctrinal presentation. They likewise adapt themselves to the subsequent formalism of the doctrinal methods of 17th century dogmatics. It is rather something entirely different from either of these, since both have the same type of externalism and legalism in common.

Because of Luther's faith in the forgiveness of sins the Holy Scriptures by which God has proclaimed this Gospel to the world became for him *eo ipso* the norm of faith and life. For by the very fact that the Gospel makes this proclamation as such, this claim of Scripture is included, to be received with simple faith. Excluded thereby is any one-sided emphasis on one or the other of the "Scripture-principles." On the other hand the term "principle" is not well suited because neither justification nor the authority of Scripture are given for the sake of being subject to further development. This way of speaking fits rather into an intellectualistic method of systematizing, even

as to legalism in general — whether these traits be found among Catholics, Calvinists, Lutherans or anyone else.

On the other hand, the evangelical attitude of Luther upheld the authority of the Scriptures in the highest sense of the word. On the other, he retained an inner freedom over against the fact that Scripture is clothed in human language and as such subject to human processes of change (*menschliche Sprache mit menschlicher Entwicklung*). This is something quite different from either the formal or material principle, and better than either it forestalls that disparaging of Scripture which was implied by Calvinism's emphasis on the formal principle, or as Rationalism used it, or as it was abused by the emphasis given to the *analogia fidei* by the later Lutheran dogmaticians.

In regard to worship and art the Reformation has had an influence which has not always been properly evaluated. The Swiss Reformation was opposed to every form of art (cf. the removal of images, organs, bells, Liturgy and poetry). This puts it on the same plane as the Papacy by the very radicalism of its opposition to Papal sacramentalism. For in the same false and pessimistic manner both Rome and the Swiss judged creatural things to be sinful. But while the former therefore invested them with sacred qualities (*vergotteten sie*), the latter simply abolished them. This is the very essence of legalism.

On the other hand the forms that developed among Lutherans lie on an entirely different plane, that of the Gospel. Liturgy, art, music, these things were received as gifts of God and therefore used and developed according to the requirements of the prevailing conditions. The Lutheran Church has created no new style of architecture. For on the one hand there was no immediate need for building new churches, and in the case of those structures that were available no offense was taken at the general forms. They were retained as effective vehicles of the Gospel.

Only those forms were abolished that stood in the service of manifest error, e. g. the sacramental tabernacle and the monstrance. Thus the "high altar" was retained, as well as the custom of giving to churches the name of apostles and "saints," including the forms of sculpture and architecture that were connected therewith. These things Lutheran art would not have created out of itself.

Just so it was with regard to divine worship. With sound conservatism Luther had retained the liturgical forms of the Mass. Only that was changed or abolished which was positively wrong. Where the musical forms had become artificial and overdone they were simplified and thus restored to their high artistic level. For the benefit of his Latin students Luther even retained the use of that language in the liturgical forms of some of the Minor Services. But the Pericopes, the Rite of Exorcism and many other forms are something that the Lutheran Church would hardly have developed out of itself. The clerical robes of our times are products of a later age.

But Luther did influence music and poetry to an outstanding degree. As a form of art the Lutheran hymn is a work of the highest order. Previously the writing of sacred verse and music had passed through a certain preliminary stage. Now the Reformation brought it to full artistic maturity. Luther himself took the lead. At first it was practical considerations which provided the occasion. With the touch of a master he made use of these arts for the sake of providing the congregation with an opportunity for independent participation in the service. And so, just as true works of art always develop, there grew out of these beginnings a structure of text and music that stands unsurpassed to this day. To a limited degree this is true also of pictorial art.

A new form of the divine service is the examination of catechumens. This took the place of the Catholic rite

of confirmation. For this purpose Luther wrote his Catechism. This brought out the worth of the individual, even as did also the other phases of Luther's teaching. The injection of pedanticism and intellectualism into the simple *Christenlehre* (the teaching of Christians) is the manner only of a later day. But here the form answered to a need that arose when Luther's preaching encountered the current lack of even a most elementary kind of indoctrination on the part of the people.

Also in regard to political science Luther's position was not medieval but Biblical. According to the Moral Law government is ordained by God. Its outer form is a product of historical development. That is why Luther acquiesced in the way the final stage in the development of the territorial-sovereignty system was achieved by the Smalcaldic League, even though he was aware that, as always, so also here much violence and injustice were involved. His business as a citizen was to obey the government which held the power. (Here, as also in cultural and sociological matters, Zwinglianism and subsequently Calvinism have often operated with legalistic coercion.)

A direct consequence was the development of the territorial-church system. Since the issue was not decided by the Word of God, it was in itself a matter of indifference for Luther when the Princes assumed the responsibility of caring for the church, not only by protecting orthodoxy but by the suppression of heresy. His one concern was that the Gospel be granted free course, also by their particular way of handling such matters. This does not run counter to his statements saying that the Gospel seeks to be accepted without coercion; or that in the case of the Bohemians, 1520-23, he had spoken up for the autonomy of those congregations. But now the system of directing the affairs of the Church by consistories came into being, a system by which jurists and theologians would, in the name of the territorial ruler, conduct the external administration in every

detail. Eventually this became a situation where the churches and their doctrine were subjected to harsh coercive measures. But this is a degenerative process, similar to the tyranny of priests or mob-rule by the laity, and is in no way a consequence of Luther's theoretical ideas, or of the practical measures which he employed.

At this time this combination of Church and State made for the expansion of the Church and in some instances was carried out in a manner entirely unobjectionable. On the other hand, because of the unevangelical interests of all concerned it did lead to many an unsound situation, such as: the German tendency toward fragmentation of political units; the system of court theologians; the secularizing of monasteries and church properties for the enriching of the Princes; an exaggerated conservatism in all areas of life; the manner of distinguishing between divine and natural Law as it was cultivated at that time. Frequently this combination of Church and State also determined the political alliances of states and their relations with each other as well as with foreign lands.

The Reformation influenced the entire educational system to a significant degree, an influence that must be given an accurate evaluation. The very fact of the rise of Luther served to liberate and at the same time to stimulate the spirit of men. In giving his inaugural address at Wittenberg in 1518 Melancthon spoke on "*De corrigendis adolescentiae studiis*," Concerning Improvements in the Studies (viz. courses) of Youth. In his Address to the German Nobility in 1520 Luther discussed the reforming of the universities; 1524 he called on the German magistrates to provide for Christian schools (*Lateinschulen*); in his Sermon of 1530 he advised that all children, boys and girls, be given an education. To this end he called for additional schools, libraries, as well as for laws making attendance at schools compulsory. Results began to appear at the schools and universities. But when in many territories the

Catholic Church began to decline and thereby the endowments for Masses became less and less, and when in addition the Revolt of the Peasants destroyed many of the existing schools, the entire educational system suffered a serious reverse. For this one will, of course, not hold the Reformation accountable. But when order was restored and the situation had returned to normal, there followed a flourishing of Protestant education such as the Middle Ages had never known.

Certainly, this was not yet true popular education, schooling for all. Widespread poverty did not permit this. Where something of that kind did exist it was because the sexton or verger (*Kuester*) of the congregation instructed the servants and children in religion according to Luther's Catechism. Yet compared with the Middle Ages even this was eminent progress, and the book itself has not been surpassed to this day. The cities had their Latin schools after the model of Johannes Sturm's *Gymnasium* in Strassburg. In the Lutheran territories the universities were organized by Melancthon. Everywhere the ecclesiastical and theological disciplines outranked all others. Humanism as such lost ground, becoming an auxiliary discipline, albeit a valuable one. What is today spoken of as the academic freedom of the sciences did not yet exist. Yet it would be wrong to say that in the period of the Reformation the sciences were fettered in any way. That did not happen until the 17th century. In Luther's day the way was open for scientific investigation of every kind.

So there was for instance a reinvigorated study of exege-
sis. Luther would have nothing to do with allegory, and his hermeneutical principles really sum up everything that is to be said on the subject. At the same time, what Luther says about the subject is said with a spirit of unsurpassed freedom and naturalness. Yet no one can emphasize the principle of verbal inspiration more strongly than did Luther. That would indicate that these two qualities probably go together. Many instances of this kind are scattered

here and there throughout Luther's exegetical writings, and stand in a firm, clearly defined inner relationship to each other, so that only dogmatic one-sidedness could fail to notice it.

Anti-Papal polemics led to a critical study of history and thereby opened the way for a deeper understanding of processes of history. Shortly after Luther's death Matthias Flacius Illyricus and others published the "Magdeburg Centuries," (1559 - 1574, in 13 volumes, each covering a century of church history). Only after Luther's death did the growing influence of Melanchthon create a situation where dogmatics was hailed as the Queen of Sciences. It was, of course, meant to be only the *ancilla theologiae*, the hand-maid of theology, which it in fact remained, as far as the inner attitude of the theologians was concerned. But in its outward form and because of the Aristotelian influence it soon manifested that desire to dominate in various ways which soon became detrimental to Lutheran theology.

The Lutheran parsonage served to elevate the plane of family life. Elimination of the negativism of Catholic marriage laws made for the possibility of divorce. The social order did not change greatly since that is dependent on economic conditions to a greater degree than on the intellectual factors. The *per capita* income of the people at large was raised indirectly by the spirit of liberalism which the Reformation had engendered among the Princes and their officials, as well as the direct observations made in connection with the visitation of the churches, even though not all German territories participated to the same degree. Because of the influence of the cities the southwestern and western areas along the Rhine had a distinct advantage.

Public morality was affected by the Reformation in a two-fold way. Whenever old institutions break down there is always an outbreak of immorality and crime, conditions which previously were held in check by the coercion of outward

discipline. Nor had all who were followers of the Reformation experienced that inner transformation which is a fruit of the Gospel. Nevertheless, that power of God did manifest itself in the congregations by the fact that now an entirely different higher view of life began to assert itself. The doctrine of the freedom that is created by faith proved itself in the life of the Lutheran citizens, grew stronger and steeled them for the test that finally came in the Smalcaldic War, a test that in which the people as a whole did not fail.

Another institution to experience the influence of the Reformation was the system of jurisprudence. The severity of the penal code was indeed not ameliorated. Torture and the trial of witches were continued for another hundred and fifty years. But Canon Law was abolished, whereas Roman Law, which did not come to Germany until this 16th century, but which in its codification by Justinian had acquired a certain Christian style and tone, now by Melanchthon's efforts became firmly entrenched.

So also the spirit of national pride was strengthened by the fact that Luther was completely uninhibited in his wrath against "die Welschen" (those foreigners — here particularly with reference to Italy, but sometimes including France and even England). It was not merely by chance that the man through whom the Pauline thoughts were finally in all their heart-felt profundity brought again to the light arose and flourished in Germany. And that the German people understood their Luther was due in large part to the fact that in his Bible-translation he had given them a common language, something that made possible a certain feeling of intellectual unity in spite of all their political fragmentation. This trend toward unity in the development of the language had been making itself felt in the various chancelleries since the 14th century without anyone being particularly conscious of such a goal. But in this great work of Luther it found its great and universal significance. Closely connected, however, with this factor of nationalism

is the other fact that in the Reformation the two trends of Protestantism went apart. Calvinism is essentially English and French, That contributed to their separating from Germany, doing so in this twofold way (German nationalism and the divergent religious trends — Ed.), just as since that day the other nations have consistently arrived at positions hostile to Germany.

With all their willingness to meet other nations half-way, the Germans because of a certain intellectual superiority have a way that on the one hand strikes others as arrogance, yet on the other causes them to look down on the Germans with contempt. These antagonisms to the German way were fastened on Calvinism when in the following period it took its course to the Western nations of Europe. But to a certain extent they were an inherent consequence of Calvinism itself. The inwardness of the German way was deepened and ennobled by Luther's work. The externalism of the West-Europeans has been intensified by their Calvinism.

EDITOR'S NOTE: The foregoing, particularly the last paragraph in this broad survey of the impact of the Reformation on the general culture of the Germany of that day may cause some lifting of eyebrows. It could have been omitted. But it seems that a man of Koehler's stature needs neither such petty correction nor feeble protection. But there is something that we may learn here.

The book was published in 1917, prior to the entry of the United States into World War I, but in a time when the feelings of men were deeply involved. We value Koehler for his sometimes uncanny perceptiveness and profound understanding of past events, above all for the way in which his every judgment is related to the Gospel. We feel for him as one senses that his emotions are becoming involved, surely in spite of his conscious efforts to eliminate this subjective element. It is pointless to speculate

what his attitude might have been had he lived to see the rise of Hitlerism and the events of World War II. It is enough to take what he wrote in the frame of the time in which he wrote and against the background of those events, and so seek truly to understand him.

But for the sake of rounding this survey of Koehler on the impact of the Reformation on the general culture of Germany we present another chapter (§197) in which he discusses the final phases of the Protestant Reformation and the beginnings of the Catholic Counter-reformation.

The substance of the history of this period from 1555 to 1580 is not easy to determine. It is during this period that the savage struggle between Catholicism and Calvinism was fought in Western Europe. There is an obvious connection between this and the fact that after the initial shock over the outbreak of the Reformation Catholicism had recovered its composure and at the Council of Trent had organized its forces for the counter attack. So one is inclined to count this period as part of the Counter-Reformation. One may also note that with the year 1548 (the Leipzig Interim) there began also for Lutheranism a new period, one that extended beyond 1580 into the time of Lutheran scholasticism. In spite of the conflict between Gnesio-Lutherans ("genuine Lutherans") and Philippists (followers of Melanchthon) the theological method of Melanchthon prevailed, and his foremost pupil, Martin Chemnitz, came to be the chief architect of the Formula of Concord. So one might like to combine the period from 1548 to 1580 with the activities of the dogmaticians of the 17th century, particularly because they concerned themselves chiefly with an elaboration of the confessional writings.

Nevertheless, it is in both of these cases better to locate transition from Reformation to Counter-Reformation in the time between 1580 and 1598. The real Counter-Reformation is the campaign launched from Rome and carried out under the leadership of the Jesuit Order with

the objective of regaining the lost territories, first by means designed to win the minds, then by the use of military power in the great Thirty Years' War. Of this the West European War against Calvinism is not yet a part. It is rather a parallel to the struggles of the Evangelicals in Germany from 1521 or 1531 to 1555, first against the enforcement of the Edict of Worms and then against the terms of the Diet of Augsburg (1547: the Interims, leading finally to the second phase of the Smalcaldic War. - Ed.). This was the first military conflict, something that Protestantism had to endure everywhere, primarily for the sake of securing its right to outward existence.

This brought out the difference between the character of the Evangelicals in Germany and that of the Calvinists in England, France and Holland. To a certain extent, the former was derived from Luther's evangelical influence, though certainly in part also from the characteristically German lack of a sense of common purpose. That was the cause of their hesitation, their mutually conflicting courses of action, and the indecisive treaty of peace. The Calvinists share the qualities of the West-European nations which were quicker to unite for common action and to defeat the foe with his own weapons. This in turn was well suited to the quality of hardness with which Calvin had imbued his followers. This gives Calvinism an edge in outward affairs, but at the same time involves a lack of inner depth where it does succeed. That is why the first religious wars of Western Europe are to be treated as counterpart to the Smalcaldic War in the time of the Reformation.

A similar judgment is called for by the further intellectual development of Protestantism, not only in Germany but also in the western nations. The doctrinal controversies that grew out of the Leipzig Interim still are a part of the Reformation. They involved the church in the problem of becoming aware of the broad inter-connection of these hard-won doctrines, as well as the regaining of unity after a struggle over divisive issues. In this conflict the Book of

Concord demonstrated the victory of the Lutheran party over Philippism. The Lutheran principles which oppose all attempts at artificial construction and systematization still prevailed, drawing their vitality directly from Scripture. But after the Lutheran Church had received its confessional symbols there came the era of Lutheran scholasticism, a method which took the doctrinal content as a whole and now, contrary to the manner of Luther, attached greater importance to the perfecting of the system than to drawing the doctrine directly out of Scripture itself. In this respect the work that preceded 1580 still belongs to the Reformation era; the dogmatics of the 17th century to a period when the original spiritual vigor had declined.

In the Reformed Church things took a somewhat different course. During the military conflicts confessions were still drawn up in a number of countries on the basis of Calvin's *Institutio* and against Catholicism. These were then defended by force of arms. But when internal issues were taken up at the Synod of Dort, 1618, the various schools of thought began to go apart. Here again the difference appears between the Lutheranism of Germany and the Calvinism of other lands. Where in spite of their natural individualism the Germans were in their religion drawn together by the Scriptures, the West-Europeans with all their natural inclination for common action were nevertheless divided by their religious individualism. Even as Lutheran scholasticism, so also this rise of individualism is the result of an intellectual exhaustion. That is why the Counter-Reformation of Catholicism was given an opening for an attack.

As for the history of Catholicism it must, of course, be granted that the founding of the Order of Jesuits could be considered the beginning of the Counter-Reformation if that were the only point of consideration. But if one notes that at the end of the 16th century everything, also among Catholics, went into a state of intellectual decline (in this connection Koehler notes the regeneration of the Jesuit Order

by Aquaviva --Ed.), and if one further notes that all of this is tied together with the sum-total of world events, then it is better to count this first recovery of the Catholic Church and its occasional moderation toward Protestants as part of the Catholic Reform movement and its tendency to compromise which began in the thirties and continued to the end of the century.

* * * * *

(The following chapters then supply the detail for these rather general introductory observations. —Ed.)

REQUEST FOR BOOKS AND PERIODICALS

Our Immanuel Lutheran Seminary Library is looking for additional copies of the following books which are out of print:

Concordia Triglotta
Ylvisaker: The Gospels
Fritz: Pastoral Theology

For completing files of periodicals:

Lehre und Wehre: 1855, 1856, 1857, 1859, 1860,
 1861, 1867, 1868.

Concordia Theological Monthly:
 1951: January, March
 1952: October, November, December
 1953: January through May, July through October
 1956: March

E. Reim
 Route 22—Claymore Lane
 Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701

PREACHING THE WORD

ISAIAH FIFTY-THREE AND THE NEW TESTAMENT GOSPEL

EDITOR'S NOTE: *Having presented a translation in blank verse of this great chapter of Isaiah in our last issue, we now offer a number of excerpts from Professor Aug. Pieper's commentary on this text. The particular passages to which these excerpts refer are indicated in each case.*

ISAIAH 53:4-6: JEHOVAH'S SERVANT, THE BEARER OF OUR SINS.

This strophe explains the mystery of the inhuman degradation of the Servant as it was pictured in the preceding verses. The burden of sin-guilt that the Lord had laid on Him was not His own, but that of others, ours in fact, the guilt of God's people. This had fallen on Him in the form of the punishment which had made Him the most despised of men, a Sufferer without equal. This strophe reveals the very heart of God's great Plan of Salvation, and with such clarity as nowhere else in the Old Testament. This is the first passage to put into their proper perspective ("in's rechte Licht setzen") all the Messianic prophecies, from Gen. 3:15 to Mal. 4:2ff, particularly Isaiah's own statements concerning the Virgin's Son, the Prince of Peace, the Rod of Jesse, the Conqueror of Death (25:8), the Cornerstone in Zion (28:16), the Way of Holiness (35:8), everything, in fact, that he has preached about the Servant of Jehovah. Upon the foundation of these three verses rests the entire New Testament Gospel concerning the righteousness of faith as

it was preached particularly by Paul. "The chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and by His stripes we are healed." These words are the New Testament Gospel in its entirety, not a single word needs to be added. This is the truth that proves itself as the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, that works faith and the new birth and sanctifies unto eternal life. What Strauss said of the Twenty-second Psalm, namely that it is "the program according to which the disciples of Jesus let their story of His life and suffering unfold," that is what Isaiah Fifty-three is in fact. But we add: by the Holy Ghost. Another point refers to the words: "Surely, He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows." When some interpreters take these words and suggest that Israel as a nation is here described as the suffering subject, this is something to which, by the power of the Spirit dwelling within them, believers will react as to an offensive and ungodly perversion and as blasphemy against the Holy One of Israel. . . .

Verse 6: What is meant here is what is said of the Lord in Matth. 9:36 (But when He saw the multitudes, he was moved with compassion on them, because they fainted, and were scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd). The reference is to a wandering in a spiritual wilderness. And that was ever and again the sin of Israel, from their first complaining cries as they faced the Red Sea (Ex. 14:11) down to these words of Christ, yes, down to the present day. What is said in these two sentences was the burden of constant reproof by all the prophets, was the lament of Isaiah in his first chapter, was even in the days of the Exile a matter of constant recurrence. It is Israel's erring from faith, its ever recurring apostasy from its Covenant God, its countless P'SHAIM, breaches of faith from which it would not be healed, the continuation of which brought them into the Exile and eventually led to their being rejected. Israel had become like those Gentiles whom since the days of Abraham God had suffered to walk in their own ways (Acts 14:16; see also Psalm 81:12). So, like these Gentiles, yes, even more so, they were ripe for rejection. But God did

not reject His people. Rather, as they were blindly stumbling toward their doom, He did "lay on Him (His Servant) the iniquity of us all (lit., let all our guilt fall on Him, His Servant). Sin is guilt, and by virtue of God's holiness and punitive justice carries with it its own punishment. It smites its own author (den eignen Taeter). The soul that sinneth, it shall die (Ezek. 18:20). But this is now the counsel of God, that its punishment should fall, has in fact fallen, not on the guilty doer, 'us,' but on 'Him,' His Servant, who according to verse 4, had willingly taken our griefs and sorrows upon Himself. So He was as "One Judged," smitten of God and afflicted, but not for sins that He had done. "The Lord did lay on Him the sin-guilt of us all."

Verse 10: ("an offering for sin" —ASHAM).

Much has been written about the meaning of this ASHAM. First of all one should read the following chapters from Leviticus: 5, 6, 7, 14 and then beginning at ch. 19:22 to the end of chapter 22; also Numbers 5:5-10; 6:1-12; then II Kings 12:17 and Ezra 10:19. ASHAM as sin is that by which injury is done, either to God, or to one's neighbor in that which is his. It calls for restitution. Therefore ASHAM as a sacrifice is one by which such restitution is made. It does penance for sin not so much in the sense of punishment (that would be the sin-offering), but makes good by compensation in excess over whatever harm has been done. What is particularly to be noted is that this type of offering really is based on a personal awareness of guilt and a voluntary admission of the wrong that has been done. As our substitute in suffering the Servant of Jehovah has taken our sin upon His conscience as an injury toward God, has felt it as a personal guilt of His own, and has rendered satisfaction for it unto God with His own life.

With the words "He shall see His seed" there begins a series of consequent clauses. Being statements of the prophet concerning the purpose, they should be in the subjunctive: "When His soul etc.... then He should or would see seed." Out of His voluntary sacrificial death there should

come new life, a progeny, naturally of a spiritual kind. That is John 12:24, which speaks of the grain of wheat that falls into the ground and in dying brings forth much fruit. It is Ephesians 1:19ff; 2:1-7; Colossians 2:12 and 13; Romans 6:3ff, concerning the death and resurrection of Christ, out of which there comes the Holy Spirit as the Lord and Giver of Life to souls that were spiritually dead; likewise the Gospel as a power of God unto salvation; our faith as the the New Man in regeneration; the Church as that spiritual Body of which Christ is the Head. See Psalm 22:31. But it is not simply that He shall have seed, but that He shall see seed—with His own eyes. This indicates that He shall outlive death, that He will rise again. For only as one who after His death would live again could He see seed. This is brought out even more clearly by the following: He will prolong His days, that is, will live long years. Out of this sacrificial death, offered once, there is derived eternal life, even for the Servant Himself. Romans 6:9f; Rev. 1:18. That is God's own reward to Him for His voluntary self-sacrifice. This is the passage that provides the basis for the repeated announcements of the Lord concerning His own resurrection.

The next sentence, "and the pleasure of the Lord" etc., sums up the clauses concerning the 'seeing of the seed' and 'prolong His days' under the view-point of the Plan of the Lord. For that was the goal of this Plan: to give to the Servant an eternal life and spiritual seed. This Plan should be carried out by the Servant's own hand (B'JADO), that is by His mediatorial work, namely His offering for guilt, which shall JITZLACH: prosper, succeed, be carried out, in spite of all forces to the contrary. What this plan included is summed up in ch. 9:2-7; 42; 6-7 and 49:6 (Covenant of the People, Light of the Gentiles, establishing the Kingdom of Eternal Peace), and then fully developed in passages like ch. 2:1-5 and chapters 12, 35, 60-63, 65, 66:14.

(To the foregoing excerpts we add Pieper's summary of the entire chapter, particularly because of its Christological implications and the way it relates all the individual detail to the eternal

counsel and plan of salvation according to which the Lord Jehovah governs and guides all things, even as the Obedient Servant brings it all to its successful and triumphant conclusion. --Ed.)

We cannot leave this greatest of all chapters of our prophet, indeed of the entire Old Testament, without once more reviewing its powerful content at least in its main features. The theme is announced in ch. 52:13—the great exaltation of the Servant of the Lord. In the two following verses this is then developed as an exaltation from inhuman humiliation to dominion over all gentiles and kings. Chapter 53 then brings first of all a description of this humiliation, given in four stages: verses 2-3, 4-5, 6-7, and 8-9a. Beginning with 9b and continuing to the end of the chapter, the exaltation is then described in the same number of stages. The four features of the humiliation are: 1) the profound depth of His humiliation—He was despised and rejected of men, v. 2-3; 2) the substitutionary character of His suffering—He bore the punishment for our sins, for our healing, v. 4-5; 3) His attitude (Gesinnung) in suffering—uncomplaining though innocent, yet with perfect willingness, v. 6-7; 4) the cause of His suffering—the violence of men, the faithlessness of His people, the judgment of God (NEGA'), v. 8-9a. The four stages in the description of His exaltation are: 1) His honorable burial, v. 9b; 2) His length of life (eternal) and His Seed (spiritual progeny), v. 10; 3) His soul re-freshed in the blessings He confers upon His vast Seed, v. 11; 4) His rule over the multitude of the redeemed, including the great, v. 12. — All these elaborations are held together by the thought that so it was decreed in the counsel and plan of God. That stands at the very beginning, 53:1; finds its antithesis in the last part of v. 4; re-emerges in v. 6; is dimly to be seen in the NEGA' LAMO of v. 8 (the stroke that fell on Him, viz. as judicial penalty), appears with increasing clarity in v. 9b, in order then in v. 10 to come into full view and so to govern the entire conclusion.

The more one studies this chapter, the more one is filled with amazement and wonder at the art of its composition.

The thought of a suffering Servant of the Lord who by suffering rises to superhuman glory is one that indeed appears in the Old Testament from the very outset (Gen. 3:15), is now and then implied (Num. 21), is symbolized by the ritual of sacrifice, and appears in David as a type (Psalms 8, 16, 22, etc.). But not until Isaiah is this thought developed by direct and explicit treatment, and here, after a brief preview in ch. 50:4-9, not until this 53d chapter—but here suddenly with such fulness, profundity, and wealth of detail that it seems as though 700 years later the Prophet had personally seen the suffering Savior, seen Him with his own Spirit-enlightened eyes. As one notes the clarity, the completeness and the orderly arrangement of the thoughts that are assembled here into an image of Christ that is surpassed neither by evangelist nor apostle, the frantic efforts of such text-critics as Duhm and Cheyne (in SBOT) who seek throughout the entire chapter to point out additions, interpolations and almost hopeless corruptions of the text in order to replace them with their own conjectures are dissipated like butter in a hot sun. Indeed, they seem downright childish. The same is true of the efforts of those unbelieving modern commentators who, like the Jews, see in the Servant of the Lord a reference to the Nation of Israel which by way of suffering and shame rises to a position of leadership and rule over a world of nations. They are thrown into utter confusion by the way this chapter describes, not an idea, not a collective unit, not a personification, but a Person, and individual, a fact which even Duhm recognizes. The very idea that one nation should bear the sins of all the others and thereby redeem them in order thus to attain the rule over them is senseless and would in all the rest of Scripture find not a single word of support. It is a carnal perversion of the hope of Israel which, wherever it does appear, is to be taken spiritually and never is presented in this particular form of a glory that is to be earned by way of a substitutionary suffering. And what is more, even if every other detail of the picture presented here could be referred to a nation, —yet verse 9 would make such a forced interpretation absolutely impossible. To be designated for "burial

among the wicked," or on the other hand to be "with a rich man in His death," these things can be said only of an individual, not of a nation. Finally the proper understanding is provided by the very words themselves, or the Holy Spirit in the words. For after the Lord in Luke 22:37 has applied this chapter to Himself, and after the entire New Testament has done the same, after it has step by step and in one detail after another found its fulfillment in 'the Son of Man,' no (exegetical) acumen or skill will ever succeed in applying this greatest and most glorious of all prophecies to any else than to Him. Faith will ever stand before the picture of the Savior as it is shown here and with Paul Gerhardt pray:

Be Thou my Consolation,
My Shield, when I must die;
Remind me of Thy Passion
When my last hour draws nigh.
Mine eyes shall then behold Thee,
Upon Thy Cross shall dwell,
My heart by faith enfold Thee.
Who dieth thus dies well.

(Aug. Pieper, translated by E. R.)

PAIDEIA

Shaping

the

Attention

(perhaps a reverie)

When students complain, "I can't think of anything else to write, and who has time to think when he's getting an education;" "I and many of my friends face the frustration of seeking to be good students academically and trying to really 'get an education, ' something must be wrong. And when college personnel admit, "We are, I believe, rushing our youth through their golden years. No wonder we find they are rebelling; no wonder they want more privileges. We no longer have children and college youth. All we have is miniature adults," —we are sure something must be wrong. A college professor wrote: "In my career as an elementary, high school, and now college teacher; I have heard teachers time and again say, in no uncertain terms: 'I'm sure glad I'm not in school today—I don't think I could make it;' or 'I gave a test today that even I would have trouble passing.' In many informal discussions with students, I have found their attitude one of fright, anxiety, and hope for escape. Their feet are tied so they have little or no time to drift into a daydream or even get sick for a few days; this would put them 'too far behind' to 'catch up.'" (Saturday

Review, April 17, 1965, p.67.) There must be something wrong with respect to what we are forcing upon their attention.

Upon bringing her daughter to a class in religious instruction a mother said that she was not too concerned about the amount of memory work required, but she wanted her to learn the right attitude toward the Scriptures—that for all our questions and problems we go there for the answers and the decisions. Years ago a father told his children away at Lutheran high school and college that he would not chastise them for less than optimum academic marks, but he would expect the top in department—in a day when that term was still used. So also, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness" was an attempt to shape the attention aright.

But the pressure is on to master the abstractions of those who have been "getting to know." Americans have adopted the ambition of the German university research professor to know, and know, and know (for what, don't ask), as Abraham Flexner showed so forcefully in his books a few decades ago. Despite nods of approval in the direction of our Thoreaus and the accepted insights of our Pascals, we insist that all go to college, and we join in the admiration of our contemporaries of the mastery of "knowledge about." Schools enforce it with the heartless machete of the arbitrary cut-off score.

We forget that the only time a little knowledge is dangerous is when the man with little knowledge is either in the position of teacher or in that of a professional rendering service for pay. Arthur Balfour spoke of "the pernicious doctrine that superficial knowledge is worse than no knowledge at all." Must every study be pursued to the point of specialism?

What is wrong with learning enough about some discipline, area of investigation, or field of knowledge, so

that the result is a readiness to wonder, a capacity to appreciate, an aptness to listen, a readiness to see relationships, and a capability of being awe-struck at the marvelous complexity of life? We were critical once when we read in Aristotle's Ethics that he made contemplation the highest aim of life, pagan as was his understanding; we have learned later to see both the point and the nobility of that thought.

Such heights cannot be reached without first the shaping of the attention. A little wetness in a mop makes it ready to absorb much water, but a dry one is a frustrating tool for gathering up the spilt glass. We have a duty to condition minds for receiving more by first exposing them to a little. We must get the mind's attention. With no other philosophy (defined as an understanding of how things go) could we be satisfied with the brief exposure to truth that Scripture sometimes allows us. One item of the Apostolic Creed is based on virtually only one passage of revelation—the descent into hell. The Protevangel seems like a mere snippet as it stands there reported from pristine times to bear the freight of meaning most momentous. The almost proverbial form of countless recorded truths speaks volumes for their power to affect the mind and make it want still more.

"A little learning is dangerous in one who tries to teach or use that little in professional work; it is not a danger but a source of pleasure to the observer of life as a whole. Thus does a map, yielding a superficial knowledge of geography, add to the traveler's enjoyment even though he himself could not survey the ground and draw the map." (Jacques Barzun: *Science: The Glorious Entertainment*, New York, Harper & Row, p. 27) "The man-eating clichés are ready to pounce: only the performer knows what he is talking about, because he is 'inside'—which insures that he has never stood off and compared his work with other kinds." "Science itself would never have made headway against the theological monopoly if the advocates of science had not gone 'out

of their field' to criticize philosophy and religion as amateurs. It is the very familiarity with his own shop that prevents the professional from being critical of it or contemplative about it." Ibid.

The work of estimation and analysis, comparison and criticism, evaluation and judgment, is necessary, and it cannot be left to the professionals. It is every man's Berean duty. Teachers and parents must shape the attention of learners if they are to prepare them for this increasingly difficult task, as the mass of information mounts and as gadgets and machines pullulate.

But evaluators need not be masters and performers, we repeat. One need not be able to construct a building to be able to say that a given specimen of architecture may eventually be a monstrosity. Hearers need not already know "the communication of attributes" before they "come and see;" but having seen, they are held to judge. At Cana the disciples did admirably, perhaps because their attention had already been activated. But even the Roman at the Cross got the point. God expects it.

There is a naivete that is wholesome. Teachers must take full advantage of it and shape the learner's attention. By shape we mean inform, and that in its original meaning of giving existence to, not by prescription and deterministic fashioning. It must be elicited, especially in spiritual matters by the power of the Spirit and the Word.

Attention thus becomes a power of the mind and soul and spirit. It is the muscle that so many lack, yet which every parent wishes to see in his child going out into the world. It is more a saving quality than an earning quantity. Since the child cannot avoid confrontations of many kinds, he must be able to take an attitude. If he has learned rightly to use his attention, he need not hide in obscurant eye-closing.

Because increasing specialism has enhanced its own massiveness it has discouraged wide-ranging attention. Concentration has pushed down from the graduate level into the college and then into secondary education, leaving only the common school somewhat free to range all fields—unfortunately at an age when children are too busy shaping tools of learning to have much time for learning itself (or so runs the time-serving teacher's excuse). Pressuring junior-highschool children to decide their vocation so they can be told what not to study is poor preparation for a full and satisfying life. It yields the narrowness of knowing that is sometimes blind to living, even the indifference that has often been noted in the knowledgeable. Long live spontaneity!

Still worse, specialism can ruin life and living. Caught as we are in the flood of material affluence (the reflection of knowledge and invention), we are blighted by alienation from values and pursuits that one time did appeal to the spirit of man. Periods of heights in theology as shaped by theksha

the sharpest of minds have left people starving who "lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow." So slight is the connection today between knowledge and living that the abolition of a few minds would leave the masses doubtful of survival. What has happened to attention?

Must our age fall into fatigue and anomie for lack of the individual's own energizing in the areas which alone can be described as life? Must we be told that "there is no such thing as domicile; it is a mere conception. There is no such thing as marriage; it is an abstraction... there is nothing at all but behavior-patterns"? Such is what they are saying who "know" society as a result of investigation; it is the basis for their proposed new morality. Or have we not been paying attention?

"The newly rich in scientific lore insists that water is H/2 O and cannot be those shining diamonds that you see on the lawn. He is sure that the birds are not really singing, hopping, and flying about in a delightful way, because all they are doing is mating, feeding, and avoiding their enemies. His monogamous attachment to one idea is at the cost of putting his senses and his candor in escrow. For the sake of pursuing one sublime entertainment of the mind, he prohibits other, no less admirable entertainments and drives us to exclaiming with Blake:

"May God keep us
From single vision and Newton's sleep."

Barzun, ibid., p. 295

Knowledge alone provides no satisfactory single view of life. "To claim the right to a double view is modest and not arbitrary; it imposes itself daily on our minds, as Huxley once confessed. He had tried hard, at sunset, to see the phenomenon as earth moving and not sun sinking. He could not: the sun sets: Science in this case enables us to add a vision, not to replace it." Ibid., p. 116. For which would you pay the most tuition, the knowledge or the appearance? The same writer quotes the poet Auden as musing "After Reading a Child's Guide to Modern Physics":

This passion of our kind
For the process of finding out
Is a fact one can hardly doubt,
But I would rejoice in it more
If I knew more clearly what
We wanted the knowledge for—
Felt certain still that the mind
Is free to know or not.

Ibid., p. 109.

And on the same page there is this from Jean Wahl, existentialist: "Something has destroyed a certain measure of feeling of our kinship with the universe (and) we must

give new, less conceptual tone to these ideas of infinity, time, and matter."

There is an anti-intellectualism that we have been slow to voice approval of for fear of being so easily misunderstood. That term is by some taken as an expressed aversion to being intelligent; such are beyond help. But our age and time of trouble make it necessary: abstraction as final goal and aim, with its built-in danger of being substituted for the thing it studies, can be most deadly in its consequences. It can kill attention, appreciation, involvement, without which there can be no such thing as life. Heaven forbid that the song of a bird be reduced to a mathematical report of sound vibrations, that criminal behavior be explained as consequence of environmental vectors to the exclusion of responsibility; and that religious education become the repetition of theological summaries however correctly deduced. The moment learning has signalled ending the learner's own attention it is far on the road to becoming a curse instead of a blessing. Let no formula exclude the child's view of dew as shining diamonds. Poetry has often enough been killed by amphibrachs and anapests. He has quit living who grumbles (or perhaps teaches in some school) that the violin solo is essentially the hairs of horse-tail drawn over the dead gut of cat. Abstraction can "add a vision, not replace it."

One could go on to argue that life is vastly more appearance than it is calorie-count or atomic-analysis. One could almost have sympathy for modern art in its quest for something and not just for things counted, classified, measured, scienced, conceptualized, and abstracted to death. Novelists at least had something to write about when they chronicled the rise or fall of individuals through the barriers of class, but they have not much to say about people who have been reduced to numbers or a statistical oddity. Things that move attract attention; things reduced to a concept lose both their color and their attraction.

Which brings us back to the toiling and unhappy students with whom we began. Why not let them look around? They are entranced by life's complexity, that endless interrelation and permutation of actions and events. The formulas to which we hold them in their books can be frightfully complicated. Complexity in life can be enchanting; it is an endless stimulation; and at no point does it blame or denigrate the learner. But the complicated abstractions of the arrived reducer-to-formula-and-law can both kill attention and lead to catatonic stupor, the state in which Americans are increasingly finding themselves. Some things are just too much!

Martin Galstad

==== PANORAMA ====

A PLEASURE TO REPORT

In previous issues (October '64 and December '64) we gave our readers full information concerning a serious charge that had been lodged against our Church of the Lutheran Confession by a district of the Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod, a charge of blasphemy, advanced with the declared purpose of terminating the discussions that had been going on intermittently between representatives of that synod and our C.L.C. Board of Doctrine. Since the express purpose of those meetings had been to remove, if possible, the differences lying between us, and because publication of this charge in the official publication of the Synod might have meant that the entire body was concurring, not only in the charge but also in its purpose, this could hardly be ignored.

So we spoke, spoke frankly about the seriousness of such a charge, and about the grave responsibility involved in making it.

It is therefore a pleasure to report that according to correspondence submitted by our President Albrecht at the recent Pastoral Conference, April 27-29, tentative steps are being taken by the Wisconsin Commission toward resumption of our discussions. It is a pleasure to report this because it means the demand of one district (to discontinue the discussions) has been overruled by the sober judgment of the other eight districts which see the need of continuing the discussions. It is true, the offer is made with certain restrictive stipulations. Yet these do not seem to present any insurmountable obstacles, since we do find ourselves in agreement on the basic points of the suggested procedure. Lest there be any further undue delay in this undertaking, President Albrecht was encouraged by the Conference to assure the Wisconsin Commission of our general agreement and desire to facilitate the clearing up of those points which might still be subject to misunderstanding.

So one may hope that at least the technical obstacles may soon be removed and that there may be a resumption of mutual discussion, dealing with what has been described as the current position and practice of both bodies in order to determine whether the principles of church fellowship which our two bodies presently hold are in agreement.

Pray God this may be soon.

E. Reim

THE POWER OF THE PURSE According to the Milwaukee Journal of May 3 the Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA) in that city is now troubled by a conservative-liberal split. In keeping with modern liberal trends the Cleveland Convention of this "Y" had dedicated the national organization to a threefold public affairs program in support of international peace and good will, economic and social justice, and basic individual rights and liberties. Objections were raised by conservative directors of the Milwaukee program, presumably

on the grounds that such objectives went beyond the intention of the original founders. This drew a sharp rebuke from the editors of that influential newspaper, who argued that such an unpopular attitude would be incompatible with the views and opinions of the many Milwaukeeans who had contributed so generously to the support also of the YWCA by way of the Community Chest Fund.

We are not concerned about the controversy itself. The Milwaukee people can decide that. But we are interested because this incident shows what is expected of those who depend on these drives for a substantial, perhaps major, part of their support. Sound judgment has usually kept Lutherans out of these things, even though they may have been hard pressed with regard to their own institutions. We shall be well advised to abide by this policy of not begging support from such community funds. For there is a moral, albeit, a negative one, and the German has an apt proverb for it:

"Wess' Brod ich ess, dess' Lied ich sing."

Whose bread I eat, his song I sing.

Our independence is well worth the price.

E. Reim

MINISTERS
OF CHRIST

This is the title of a book from the hand of Professor John P. Meyer on Paul's Second Letter to the Corinthians. While the title is unusual as to its form, it immediately reveals the great purpose of this Epistle, even as it reveals something of the purpose and method of the author. In writing the Preface Professor Frederic E. Blume states that while Prof. Meyer had been the dogmatician of Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary for so many years, yet his real interest lay in the words of Scripture, both Old and New Testaments. Then he continues:

"Those of us who have been closely associated with the author of this *Commentary* have good reason to surmise, however, that his great joy in teaching at the Seminary was the course in the New Testament that he has given year after year to the men of the incoming class. Though entitled "Isagogics," the course was not one in Introduction in the ordinary sense of the word. Matters of Introduction the men had studied in their college years. But now, on the basis of the Greek text, they were led through the thought of the Book of Acts and the epistles of the New Testament by a master. Without hesitation he could give, in Greek, the Pauline expression for any given concept, and who could account, as far as this can be done at all, for the particular sphere of activity in which any New Testament figure was engaged during any season of a given year. In this course Professor Meyer *lived* the New Testament, and his students, to a degree, lived it with him. His *Commentary on Second Corinthians* has been the outgrowth of a part of that course.

As one who has also worked together with the author for many years, your reviewer is ready to second this statement with all conviction.

Those who knew John Meyer as a teacher—and that includes most of the pastors of our CLC—will recognize his touch on almost every page. There is indeed a passage (page 63-64) which speaks of "legalistic rigorism" in dealing with an erring brother, which makes it a matter of Christian judgment to determine when the limit has been reached, and which refers rather sharply and pointedly to those whose attitude would be "to insist on absolute uniformity of judgment, and to leave a body if the majority is not yet ready to accept such a judgment." Yet everyone must surely understand that this depends entirely on the validity of the reasons for such action in each specific case. And these reasons are not discussed in this purely hypothetical case.

Probably the author had some of us in our CLC in mind. Yet that should not in the least detract anything from the solid merit of the book, a quality which characterizes it throughout, but which comes to a climax in the treatment of chapter 5:18-21, the Great Reconciliation. Beginning with the concepts of substitution and imputation as they appear in verses 14-15 and including that of appropriation from verse 17, the author with his usual meticulous care defines his terms, objective and subjective, as they have been employed in connection with justification and its synonym, reconciliation. This is followed by a tracing of the use of those terms, first in the Brief Statement, then in the Common Confession; which leads in turn to an instructive discussion on the doctrinal issues involved. A final contribution to this discussion is the demonstration by quotations from Luther and the Confessions of the 16th century which show that the thoughts expressed by these terms were in current use in those days, even though the technical terminology is of a later date.

What follows in the discussion of the actual passage, verses 18-21, is classic, both for the thoroughness of the philological discussion (on *καταλλάσσω*) and for the lucidity of the treatment of the subject matter. When this then is followed by a further treatment of this same term as it is used in Romans 5, the total effect is that of a carefully balanced and thoroughly convincing statement on the interrelation of justification as Paul treats it in Romans and reconciliation as we have it in Second Corinthians 5.

In a time when so much confusion is being sown in connection with these two great Gospel terms, this chapter alone justifies not only the purchase, but a most careful study of this important book.

E. Reim

C O N T E N T S

VOLUME 5

MAY, 1965

NUMBER 2

-
- THE IMPACT OF THE REFORMATION
ON THE CULTURE OF GERMANY. 1
John P. Koehler—E. Reim

- PREACHING THE WORD
ISAIAH FIFTY-THREE
AND THE NEW TESTAMENT GOSPEL 22
Aug. Pieper—E. Reim

- PAIDEIA
SHAPING THE ATTENTION (perhaps a reverie) 29
Martin Galstad

- PANORAMA
A PLEASURE TO REPORT 36
THE POWER OF THE PURSE 37
MINISTERS OF CHRIST (A Review) 38

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.