



"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 7

MAY 1967

NUMBER 2

1 9 6 7

With an introductory essay in this issue of the Journal we open our formal observance of the 450th anniversary of the Reformation. It is fitting that we should wish to be heard on this subject of major interest and that we should endeavor to say something that is worth hearing. The significance of the Reformation for our time is such that the opportunity to bear witness to its Gospel heart could not possibly be forfeited by a church body devoted to the public confession and dissemination of the Truth as it is in Christ Jesus.

Because we are firmly dedicated to that task, the tenor of our response to the Grace of God which so richly endowed us with spiritual blessings through the Reformation will doubtless bear little resemblance to the tone of the messages that will originate in the elaborate observances of the anniversary year planned by some other church bodies. This we would have expected even before we examined the various pamphlets, bulletins and programs already received in the mails. At a later date we hope to take occasion to comment on some of the subjects treated and judgments expressed in other periodicals and at mass gatherings in reference to the Reformation theme.

For the present it will suffice that we define what we believe to be the nature of a God-pleasing and therefore proper commemoration of the Reformation event. Such an observance must focus attention upon the glorious light of the saving Gospel

which, by the mighty workings of God so evident in the period of the Lutheran Reformation, was permitted to shine abroad in the earth with a brilliance that we continue to enjoy to this day. To recognize this, to point it out, and for its blessings to pay tribute to the God of mercy - that constitutes the true motivation and justification for a year of jubilee.

The Editor.

---

## HOW GOD PREPARED THE WORLD FOR THE REFORMATION

There is a searching into the ways of God that is fruitless and foolish. No one should expect to be able to plumb the depths of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God; for indeed His judgments are unsearchable and His ways are past finding out. No one has known the mind of God and no one has been His counsellor. It is indeed true, as the preacher puts it in the Book of Ecclesiastes: "When I applied mine heart to know wisdom, and to see the business that is done upon the earth;... Then I beheld all the work of God, that a man cannot find out the work that is done under the sun: because though a man labour to seek it out, yet he shall not find it; yea farther; though a wise man think to know it, yet shall he not be able to find it." 8:16.17. In view of

these truths it may appear that we have set ourselves an impossible task in trying to explore the preparations God made for the Reformation; for who will dare to say that he has discerned all the workings of God's hand in the history which paved the way. It is fair to say that many things which we have not regarded as preparatory to the Reformation will be revealed as such when our sight is opened to see all things in the light of glory. Surely William Cowper was right when he wrote these words of a familiar hymn:

God moves in a mysterious way  
His wonders to perform;  
He plants His footsteps in the sea  
And rides upon the storm.

Deep in unfathomable mines  
Of neverfailing skill  
He treasures up His bright designs  
And works His sov'reign will.

Blind unbelief is sure to err  
And scan His work in vain;  
God is His own interpreter,  
And He will make it plain.

Yes, God will make it plain. Already in this life He opens up the scroll so that we may see as much of the working of His hand as it is good for us to see. It is quite typical, however, that we often fail to see and recognize the wondrous ways of God in history at the time of occurrence. Thus for instance we may take an example from the public

ministry of Jesus. At an appointed time, when Jesus knew that His hour was come that He should depart out of this world unto the Father, He took a towel and having girded Himself, poured from a basin upon His disciples' feet and proceeded to wipe them with the towel wherewith He was girded. To Peter this seemed to be so unfitting and accordingly he objected. Then it was that Jesus said: "What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter." John 13:7. That Jesus was here giving His disciples an example of humility and of self-effacing service was not clear to Peter at the time when he was approached, but later the significance of the whole glorious act in the upper room was opened to him. And so we find him writing in the first epistle: "Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock. And when the chief shepherd shall appear ye shall receive a crown of glory, that fadeth not away. Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder. Yea, all of you be subject one to another and be clothed with humility; for God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble. Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time." I Pet. 5: 2-6. It is indeed a common experience that we do not recognize the hand of God and the purpose of its working until time has elapsed and the significance of it all has been revealed. Thus it is often precarious to interpret an event in history too soon unless indeed we have a clear Word of God that points the way.

With regard to the Reformation which certainly was the work of God, we have the advantage of viewing it now on the backdrop of several intervening centuries. Particularly when we consider the preparations which God made for this glorious event we may be able at this vantage point of time to see things in their proper light which were not so clear to men when they occurred. It is certainly right and proper to give these matters our earnest attention in order that our faith might be strengthened thereby and that as teachers we might be the better prepared to transmit the results of our God-directed studies to those who have been placed into our charge by the Lord's call.

In order that we may proceed with this study from the proper vantage point it is important that we have a clear understanding of what it was that God was preparing for. We must have a clear understanding of the Reformation itself. Some secular historians have termed it a "Protestant Revolt" and have spoken of it as a "Religious Revolution". Even some who bear the Lutheran name, but deserve it not, have spoken of it in this way and as a consequence have advocated a judicious return to the Roman Church. Reformation, however, if we are to take the word in its original connotation, would indicate a movement to cleanse the church of abuses and doctrinal errors. Surely it was not Luther's original intention to be severed from the Roman Church but under God to purge it and return it to the pristine purity of the apostolic Church. That this did not succeed but resulted in the papal ban and excommunication was not of Luther's choosing. But God permitted things to reach this pass in order that

His Gospel might have free course without the legalism, the superstition and the hierarchy of the Roman papacy which stood in the way of Sola Scriptura, Sola Gratia, and Sola Fides. It was God's will that there should be a clear-cut separation and division in order that the truth might stand free of the corrupting leaven of false doctrine and unscriptural and superstitious practices. In His omniscience God knew what lay in the future for His Church and accordingly He prepared the ground, shaped and molded men, directed events in order that His name might be hallowed, that His kingdom might come and that His gracious will might be done as we pray in the Lord's Prayer. As we give our attention to the years preceding the Reformation we will see clear traces of the preparations God was making for it. In God's economy things were just right for the Reformation when it came. If we will but open our eyes to it, we will be able to discern the guiding hand of God

- I. in the state and in world affairs
- II. in the field of learning
- III. in the Church.

#### I.

The political sphere as it pertains to the period preceding the Reformation presents a vast area of inquiry. There are a number of aspects which should be noted, as they have a direct bearing upon the dawn of the Reformation. This was an age of power politics in which rulers were so busy trying to establish dynasties by conquests and inter-marriages that the pope who sought to wield his

power and to exert his influence upon earthly rulers was not able to use them as he desired for the purpose of suppressing opposition to his dominion. Had the pope been able to exert his power over earthly rulers in an unrestricted manner, he would have liquidated all his opponents. However, the Lord of the Church, the King of kings, governed things so that the political climate would be favorable to action necessary for the preservation of His Church.

To the casual reader of world history it might appear that the Roman Catholic Church had control of the situation since it seemed to control the purse and the people. Emperors were under such obligations to the Roman Church that it might appear that any papal order could not well be ignored by them. Humanly speaking, then, any reform movement which met with the displeasure of the Roman Church had no chance because of anticipated opposition on the part of the church-dominated government which had the power of the sword and could incarcerate and brand anyone who stepped out of line. Here we see how divine providence obstructed the evil plans of the kings of the earth and the rulers who took counsel against the Lord and his anointed. The King who sits on the holy hill of Zion was still in control. Maximilian I who occupied the throne immediately before the Reformation (1493-1519) and Charles V who succeeded him (1519-1556) did not dominate the German scene. An important factor in this connection was the German Diet which was under the control not of the emperor but of the seven German electors. Since the emperors had to look to the Diets for money and manpower, they were not in a position to ignore or to alienate the electors. Furthermore,



the principle of "cuius regio eius religio" (the ruler determines the religion of the people) prevailed in the German lands before the Reformation. This tended to counteract the power of the papacy. Certainly the fact that electors had such great power in their electorates worked out to the advantage of Luther who enjoyed the support and protection of Frederick the Wise. Even the pope knew that he had to keep his distance when an elector chose to take a man into his protection. A secular historian has gone so far as to say: "If the power of the Catholic Emperor over the German princes had been greater, the Reformation might have been defeated or postponed." (W. Durant, "The Story of Civilization" Vol. VI. p. 300)

The emperors who were on the throne in the period before the Reformation were not known for strength of character and stability. Frederick III, who ruled 1440-93, was an astrologer and alchemist. Under his rule Schleswig-Holstein, Bohemia, Austria and Hungary detached themselves from the Empire. Maximilian I, a man of considerable gifts, lacked a "a cool, steady will power which would remain steadfast even though his ambitions were not immediately realized. The passions of his life seem to have been: (1) to outwit and outmaneuver the French kings; (2) to ward off the rising Mohammedan threat from the East; and (3) to obtain permanent control over the rich towns of northern Italy." (Schwiebert "Luther and His Times." p. 35.) "He was constitutionally and financially incapable of sustained enterprise; he was unable to will the means as well as to wish the ends; and at times he was so poor that he lacked funds to pay for his dinner. He la-

bored to reform the administration of the Empire, but he violated his own reforms and they died with him." (W. Durant. *ibid.* p. 300. 301.) However, in the economy of God the gifts of Maximilian, particularly in linguistics, were brought into the service of the Reformation which was to dawn during his rule. He was able to speak seven or eight languages and we are assured that it was through his example and efforts that the dialects of South and North Germany merged into a "gemeines Deutsch" of which we are told that it became the language of German government, of Luther's Bible, and of German literature. (W. Durant. *ibid.* p. 301) We can well understand how this prepared the way for an important phase of the Reformation, the translation of the Scriptures into the language of the people.

Without going into any detail regarding the separate rulers in France, England and Spain, it will have to suffice to record that Louis XII had ascended the throne of France in 1498, Henry VIII had been crowned in England 1509 and Ferdinand V was on the throne in Spain. It was during this period that Columbus sailed under the patronage of Ferdinand and Isabella. Landing on American shores October 12, 1492, he was instrumental in opening up the new world which was to become the home of many true followers of Luther. We see indeed how God showed His hand in the state and in world affairs during the period preparatory to the Reformation and how He made ready the ground. What had been true of conditions in the state and in the world at the time of the Savior's birth was true also with regard to the Advent of the Reformation. All was under the control of God's hand.

## II.

As we now advance to a study of what was taking place in the field of learning, it may not be out of place at this point to call attention to an event that was to serve as a major contribution, not only to the advancement of the Reformation as such but to the cause of education in general as well. We are, of course, speaking of the invention of the printing press by Johannes Gutenberg sometime in the mid-1400s. What Gutenberg did was to invent the type mold which for the first time made printing from movable type practical. The idea of type mold was revolutionary. "The types it produced could be ranged in even lines of composition. Then they could be locked firmly together under the pressure of 'quoins' or wedges, so as to make up a 'form' or unit. Thus, a number of pages containing many thousands of types could easily be put on and taken off the press. After printing, the same types could be separated, and used again and again to set up other pages. Gutenberg adapted the ink for his press from materials known to early Flemish painters." (World Book Vol. 7. p. 429. 1960 Edition.) It goes without saying that the invention of the type mold played an important part in the Reformation mission of disseminating tracts, the Catechism, and of course, the Bible. Luther was quick to use all the means and instruments at his disposal in spreading the glad tidings of the Gospel which had so long been covered over with Roman tradition, superstition, and popery.

In any study of the background of the Reformation humanism must be given due consideration; and although much of humanism must be re-

jected, God in His wisdom made use also of it in preparing the way for the Reformation. Humanism was a new school of thought which largely represented a rebellion against scholasticism. Catholicism leaned heavily on the scholastics who sought to harmonize Christian doctrine with pagan thought. Divisions resulted, with some looking to Peter Abelard, some to Thomas Aquinas, and again others to Duns Scotus. Humanists by and large harked back to what they considered old, original purity. Literary humanists restricted their thinking more or less to such things as purified Latinity, rediscovered art, a return to the Rome of Cato. So-called Biblical humanists, the northern humanists, directed their thinking to a restoration of the old apostolic Christianity. For them, knowledge of the languages--Latin, Greek, and Hebrew--was important in the study of theology and especially in the study of the Holy Scriptures. Some say the biblical humanists were responsible for the ensuing comparison between the Roman Catholic Church and the apostolic Church established by Christ. Be that as it may, it is certain that humanism's outstanding contribution to the work of the reformers lay in the furnishing of tools such as texts, grammars, dictionaries and commentaries. Thus, for example, Luther made use of Psalterium Quintuplex in his lectures on Psalms at Wittenberg in 1513. This was the work of the humanist Lefevre who in his publication furnished the student with a textual basis besides an up-to-date commentary. The commentary censured the mechanical repetition of prayers, and placed the whole sacramental system of Rome under critical examination. It served as an encouragement

to Bible reading. We can well understand why the young Luther warmed to such a book. Furthermore, we may cite Luther's use of Erasmus' edition of the Greek New Testament, as well as his use of John Reuchlin's De Rudimentis Hebraicis, a combined Hebrew Grammar and Dictionary. We can well understand how these works of leading humanists contributed to Luther's work in the classroom and in the ultimate work of translating the Bible. While men like the Dutchman Erasmus and the Frenchman Lefevre were unwitting contributors to the Reformation, they both remained in the Catholic fold. Particularly Erasmus, with his "Freedom of the Will," became the sharpest intellectual opponent of Luther who answered him most effectively with his famous and never to be forgotten "Bondage of the Will." This however, does not remove the fact that, under God, the work that these men did in the languages was put into the service of the Reformation. For certainly the exploration of the Bible by Luther and his co-workers in the monumental task of providing a faithful translation in a language the people could read and understand was an important part of the whole Reformation movement. Luther was, at the beginning, far from being a master of Greek and Hebrew; but with the use of the tools available he rapidly developed into an able linguist. This became apparent in the years 1517 and 18 and surely in the years 1521-22 when the work of translation was begun. (The N. T. was translated at Wartburg 1521-22 and the translation of the O. T. was completed in 1534.) Through the working of God the various elements of preparation were drawn together to bring about the declaration of independence from the law religion of the papacy and its supremacy, and

the setting forth of the Gospel message of justification through the all-sufficient merits of Jesus Christ.

A study of the Lord's hand in preparing the way for the Reformation as it pertains to the field of learning would not be complete without a reference to the establishment of the University at Wittenberg. Emperor Maximilian, may it be said to his credit, made an appeal for institutions of higher learning at the Diet of Worms in 1495. While southwestern Germany had five universities, Bavaria one, and Albertine Saxony two, the Electorate of Saxony under Frederick the Wise had none. But in 1502 Frederick located a new University in his territory, the University of Wittenberg. This University, like others of its kind, was a separate corporation under the sole control of the elector. This insured the freedom of action which was to be so important to Luther and his co-workers in years to come. The institution not only provided a place for the training of loyal Reformation workers, but it also gave Luther a base from which he could carry on the important task that God had decreed for him. In the year 1535 the University of Wittenberg was re-organized by Elector John Frederick. Thereafter it was to be known as a Lutheran University. As we look upon the role that an institution of higher learning played in the Reformation, we have every reason to treasure the heritage the Reformation has left in our Christian schools. As the world knows that nothing but the best in training and education is necessary for its space programs and scientific endeavors, so we should be convinced that nothing but the best is necessary for the mission of preaching the Gospel to every creature.

(To be concluded).

C. M. Gullerud

## The Pentateuch And Its Critics

### III.

The testimony of the poetic and prophetic

The testimony of the poetic and prophetic books of the Old Testament supplements the direct and numerous expressions we have adduced from the historical books confirming the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

It is to be expected as a matter of course that we would not find in them remarks about the literary activity of Moses as direct, or references to the existing written Law as prevalent, as in the historical books. The occasion for it was lacking, and the character of the poetic and prophetic books differs greatly from that of the historical writings. But if we keep vividly in mind the great cloud of witnesses that testify to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch in the historical records from the days of Joshua to the exile and beyond, we will feel justified in recognizing similar evidence, in every mention of the Law and in every allusion to passages of the Law recorded in the other biblical books written during the same period, for the fact that the Pentateuch was known in Israel as a specific unit of literature and as a work of Moses. Must one always look for the phrase: "It is written in the law written by Moses?" Why should not the simple term "law", or a mere allusion to it, have sufficed, inasmuch as every Israelite must have known that the well-known Law,

the Thora, hatora, was meant, which according to the unanimous affirmation of the historical books originated with Moses?

We now give our attention to the most important of the relevant passages in the poetic books. What friend of the Psalms can fail to know that the entire Psalter is a glorious witness of the life of Israel in the Law and under the Law? The introductory First Psalm appropriately begins with a macarism concerning the man whose "delight is in the law of the Lord" in which he meditates day and night. How greatly does the Nineteenth Psalm magnify "the law of the Lord" as "perfect, converting the soul;" and the "testimony" ('edut, a word which according to the parallelism of the Psalms and such passages as 2 Kings 11:12 is another term for the Law) "is sure, making wise the simple." (19:8ff). And it is hardly necessary to refer to the one hundred nineteenth Psalm which opens with the words: "Blessed are the undefiled in the way, who walk in the law of the Lord," and in all but a few of its 176 verses speaks of the Law by means of a variety of designations. The one hundred and third Psalm, verse 7 declares: "He made known his ways unto Moses, his acts unto the children of Israel." Thus God's revelation was transmitted to the children of Israel through Moses; and this transmission is identifiable as "the law of Moses."

The poet-authors of the Psalms were intimately acquainted, not merely with the doctrinal content of the Law, but with the historical portions as well, as is evident at a glance in scanning Psalms 28, 95, 105, and 106. Here the manifold acts of God in behalf of His people are apostrophised. We note,



furthermore, that in Ps. 40:7 the Pentateuch is expressly called a written record. For here the expected Messiah is quoted as saying: "Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me" ("in the roll of the book, " bimegilat sepher. Even F. Delitsch concedes: "The book roll is the Thora written on animal hide").

What has thus been said of the Psalms pertains also to the other poetic books of the Old Testament, to Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon and Job. Proverbs in particular is speckled with reflections and expositions of the divine revelation presented in the Law and confirmed in the distinctive events of the life of Israel. If literal references to individual and specific passages of the Pentateuch in this and especially in the remaining three poetic books are much rarer than in Psalms and in the historical books, this is, as we have already observed, in keeping with the unique character and purpose of these books in which the manifold wisdom of God also reveals itself; as we read in Hebrews that God spoke "at sundry times and in divers manner to the fathers" (Heb. 1:1). But let it be pointed out that the expressions "tree of life" and "way of life" (Prov. 3:18; 11:30; 5:6; 10:17) obviously hark back to Gen. 3:24. Moreover, the words of Wisdom personified, "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his work of old" (Prov. 8:22ff), presuppose the Creation account in Gen. 1. And the passages Job 5:14, 31:10-11 are related to Deut. 28:29 and Lev. 18:17; 20:14. Even the Song of Solomon, which had so little occasion to refer to the content of the Pentateuch, uses the term "Mahanaim" (see marginal note in English Bible; also Hebrew Bible, chap. 7:1 and

F. Delitsch's commentary) which calls to mind the angelic armies that greeted the patriarch Jacob upon his return from Mesopotamia (cp. Song 6:13 with Gen. 32:1f).

Far more copious is the witnessing in the prophetic books. Any attempt at offering an exhaustive listing of passages would be inadvisable. But it can be briefly demonstrated that all prophets in their time, whether they labored in Judah or in the Northern kingdom, whether they were exilic or post-exilic, from first to last knew and quoted the Pentateuch. As proof we shall cite but a few passages, beginning with the prophets of Judah. Here above all we point to Isaiah, who lived and had his being in the book of the Law. Note the introductory speech: "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth: for the Lord hath spoken, I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me. The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib: but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider" etc. (Is. 1:2-9). This entire address has its roots in the Pentateuch; almost every verse and every expression is a refrain from the Pentateuch. (cp. Deut. 32; Lev. 26; Deut. 28). In one instance Isaiah expressly mentions the Law, saying of the people: "This is a rebellious people, lying children, children that will not hear the law of the Lord." (30:9). And as he writes in 3:9: "the show of their countenance doth witness against them; and they declare their sin as Sodom, they hide it not," even a rationalist like Hitzig concludes that the prophet had the story of Sodom, Gen. 19, before him. Gesenius comments on the passage 30:17, "One thousand shall flee at the rebuke of one; at the rebuke of

five shall ye flee," by saying that these words are "almost literal parallels of two passages in the Pentateuch, Lev. 26:8 and Deut. 32:30."

When we take up the book of Joel, chapter 2, verse 13 confronts us with the words: "Rend your hearts, and not your garments, and turn unto the Lord your God: for he is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness, and repenteth him of the evil." Will not everyone, including the most unlearned Bible reader, immediately catch the sound of that ancient message from the Thora: "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth"? (Ex. 34:6; cp. also 32:14). Similar proofs are available in Micah especially, but in Obadiah, Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah as well. (Micah 6:4, compare with Ex. 13:3; 20:2. Nahum 1:2 with Ex. 20:5; Deut. 4:24. Habakkuk 3:3 with Deut. 33:2).

Further observations can be made in the books of Amos and Hosea who labored in the Northern kingdom. The former exhibits a very precise knowledge of the Pentateuch. This is the more noteworthy since he was of lowly birth and had not been educated in the schools of the prophets (7:14). In the opening verses of his book he proclaims judgment upon Israel because it had rejected God's Law, and in Jehovah's name he writes: "For three transgressions of Judah, and for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because they have despised the Law of the Lord, and have not kept his commandments . . ." (Amos 2:4). Hosea on the other hand takes occasion to address the apostate priesthood: "Because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest

unto me: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children" (Hos. 4:6). This passage presupposes that the order of priests preeminently bore the assignment of occupying itself with the law; thus the forgetting and disregarding of the Law is listed as their greatest offense. The sin of the people is described in 6:7 as a breach of covenant, and the meaning of the prophet is indicated by the words in 8:1: " . . . they have transgressed my covenant, and trespassed against my law." That the prophet had a written law in mind is evident from a subsequent statement: "I have written to him (Ephraim) the great things of my law, but they were counted as a strange thing" (8:12). It is likewise worth noting that in the eleventh and twelfth chapters of his work Hosea offers so many allusions and references to the early history of Israel that every unprejudiced reader must concede that the prophet presupposes in his hearers a detailed familiarity with the stories related in the first two books of the Pentateuch, something that would be possible only if those stories were part of a written record. For Hosea refers here to the Egyptian bondage, the deliverance, the miraculous food of the desert, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, the story of the birth of Jacob and Esau, Jacob's sojourn with Laban, his labors for Leah and Rachel, his struggle with the Angel of the Lord, and so on. - Even Jonah's book mentions the Pentateuch when it, too, cites the familiar words of Exodus 34:6; 32:14 (Jonah 4:2; 3:10).

It remains for us to survey the exilic and post-exilic prophets, although there is actually little need of proving their references to the Pentateuch

since modern higher criticism does not undertake to dispute them. Jeremiah's reliance upon the books of Moses, especially on Deuteronomy, is so great that because of it the critics have sought to date the origin of the Pentateuch, or at least of Deuteronomy, in the era of this prophet. He chastises the false scribes who said: "We are wise, and the law of the Lord is with us" (8:8). He proclaims to the people the words of the covenant and in the words of the Law says to them: "Cursed be the man that obeyeth not the words of this covenant, which I commanded your fathers in the day that I brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, from the iron furnace, saying, Obey my voice, and do them, according to all which I command you: so shall ye be my people and I will be your God" (11:3f; cp. with Deut. 27:26; 4:20). For further examples note 34:13f compared with Ex. 20:2; 21:2; 48:45f with Num. 21:28f.

The book of Ezekiel, which stems out of the exile, demonstrates such familiarity with those parts of the Pentateuch which deal with the forms of worship in Israel that Graf, the predecessor of Wellhausen and a leader of the radical school of critics, simply asserts that Ezekiel must have written the last third of Leviticus, chapters 18 to 26, and that Ezra then interpolated Ezekiel's document in the Pentateuch!

From Daniel we have a quotation that speaks for itself: "Neither have we obeyed the voice of the Lord our God, to walk in his laws, which he set before us by his servants and prophets. Yea, all Israel have transgressed thy law, even by departing, that they might not obey thy voice; therefore the curse is poured upon us, and the oath that is written

in the law of Moses the servant of God, because we have sinned against him . . . . . As it is written in the law of Moses, all this evil is come upon us . . . . (9:10f). The prophet is referring to the well-known chapters Lev. 26 and Deut. 28.

The post-exilic prophets, finally, write with immense zeal for the temple of God, the Law and the priesthood, as their books abundantly reveal, and thus give recognition to the Pentateuch. Indeed, the last prophet of them all, Malachi, in the third-last verse of his work, imprints the seal of his authority, as it were, upon all earlier testimony when he uses a portion of the last page of the Old Testament to call upon Israel as a messenger of Jehovah: "Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, with the statutes and judgments" (4:14). Thus he lays down for Israel a divine revelation more than a thousand years old and of course long since committed to writing, as a guideline for the present and the future unto the day of the appearance of the Messiah.

Now what does negative criticism have to say in general concerning this evidence of the poetic and prophetic books? The critics dismiss it out of hand, exactly as they do the testimony of the Historical books but more briefly and brashly. Let us again hear Strack: "Since the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles and Daniel are post-exilic they may not without qualification be adduced for external evidence." Concerning "the witness of the prophetic and lyrical books" he blithely states: "Of all the prophets only Malachi 3:22 mentions 'the law of Moses'. Micha 6:4, Jer. 15:1 and Is. 53:11-12 do not come into consideration in the cause of the authorship of the Pentateuch, Beyond this, Moses is not

mentioned in the books of prophetic utterance. In the four Psalms where the name of Moses occurs (77; 99; 105; 106) there is no mention of a literary activity of Moses." (Introduction, 4. Edition, p. 25). That is all!

No comment on our part is necessary except perhaps the remark that Strack found it possible to overlook completely one of the most important relevant passages in the Psalm, the words we have above cited: "He made known his ways unto Moses ..." (Ps. 103:7). One can hardly regard such research as being either scientific or exact. But then, it must in all candor be said that the widely extolled modern higher criticism, as a scientific undertaking, generally leaves much to be desired!

(To be continued)

E. Schaller



---

# PAIDEIA

---

## MORE FINDINGS

Finally it is becoming permissible to question publicly some of the assumptions of democratic education without, by the very act, losing one's credentials as a critic. To be sure, some of the articulate and effective critics are being denigrated as romantic, but we suspect that that is more name-calling than it is answering their incisive charges. To imply that someone is soft-headed may mean that one has run out of arguments against him, or out of answers. Calling successful teachers-turned-critic fools did not begin in the twentieth century.

The best in good teaching has seldom come from the establishment, even as what is new and fruitful and utterly basic in any pursuit has generally come from some individual working alone. The roster of pioneering scientists and the report of their seminal findings is too well known to need recital here. It was teachers who fought the trend of their times, who managed to bring some light and life into the classroom. Now it is becoming safe to speak openly, and that is good.

It is almost expected now that honor be paid the teacher who inspires learning in spite of the well-supplied environment of his room, not always because of it. Comments like this are common: "Technological innovations will not provide the im-



proved education which our society demands. The key to improved teaching is the improved teacher. No gimmicks, no fads, no committees - just the very best teachers that money can buy." Not exactly a new discovery, but it offers hope.

In the rough and tumble of battle some long-lost strategy occasionally surfaces to consciousness again. Sometimes it is what we have forgotten that bothers most. In other words, the daily doers have a way of finding out what is effective. The new critics of American education are generally teachers, and they have found much to tell from flesh-and-blood situations.

One such successful situation, and for that reason shattering to the educational establishment, is the performance of certain Plain People in America, as they have been called, the Amish. The papers have reported it, and the periodicals have perused it. The Happening is amazing: violation of minimum standards for "decent education"; one-room, without plumbing, electricity, central heating, and proper ventilation; teachers without high-school education, almost no records, teaching aids, supplementary textbooks and references - but withal successful in its purpose, to train up the young as Amishmen.

Let detractors sniff that the aim is low, so that such success is easy. One important writer thinks otherwise: "In terms of Amish culture, the Plain People's approach to education may be one of the most effective yet devised. Their success in training the young to be farmers has impressed many agricultural experts. Unemployment, indigence, juvenile delinquency, and crime are surpri-

singly infrequent. Amish prosperity and self-sufficiency are legendary. These are not the characteristics of a preparation for adulthood that has failed." (Donald A. Erickson, assistant professor of education, University of Chicago, in Saturday Review, Nov. 19, 1966.)

Let detractors try this goal for size: to keep a community apart from the larger society as something that is evil; to keep themselves a separated people in an age where lines of demarcation have fallen; to keep in common unquestioned values, and continue customs that mark people off visibly from everyone else - goals for which they have very little going for them, but much against them.

"Perhaps it is the very success of this upbringing, as reflected in enduring Amish communities, that arouses the ire of some bureaucrats. In the Iowa conflict, county officials reportedly declared, 'We are going to assimilate these people, whether they want to be assimilated or not!'" Ibid. When officials moved against these folks, people with sympathy for the Amish, and, we suspect, sensing principles, blistered them with angry protests, and they found it wise to retreat. Some officials have shown sense. In Ohio one Department of Education leader suggested that they be allowed to satisfy the attendance law by starting school a year later than usual and spending two years in the first grade! In Pennsylvania it has been approved as education, that the children be allowed credit for performing farm and household duties, attending school but a few hours each week.

Something is coming to the surface. "Many public educators would be elated if their programs

were as successful in preparing students for productive community life as the Amish system seems to be. In fact, while some public schoolmen strive to outlaw the Amish approach, others are being forced to emulate many of its features. As tax-supported education struggles with the dropout and potential dropout, it is introducing sizable components outside school walls, as in the Job Corps and many other work-study programs.... In short, there is no basis in educational theory, research, or experience for insisting, as does the equivalence dogma, that the within-four-walls approach of the typical public school is the only way adequately to educate the nation's future citizens. At times a nonpublic school that provides a particular group of students with a thoroughly appropriate preparation for the adult life they will lead may differ so fundamentally from nearby public schools that the notion of parity is farcical. When are oranges and orangutans equivalent?" Ibid.

What is surfacing here? For one thing, Luther's suggestion that children go to school an hour or two a day, and then spend the day among the adults in their work. For another, the Hebrew education which was wholly among adults, who were also to talk to the children about the Word and wisdom and way of the Lord; the training of the Greeks and Romans, which was considerably a learning by doing; and the education of the famous reformers, some of whom went so far as to live with their wards and charges.

Its triumph is in this that it is organismic, even as Amish culture is exactly that. Now, we need not choose the Amish type of harmonious community,

where each part depends on all the rest, where the entrance of modern inventions and outside ways of life would destroy the rural community and end its record of successes described above. But there is something about the Amish. "The existing evidence shows no trace of former Amishmen who are struggling unsuccessfully to adjust to the outside world... In most respects the Amish must be viewed as good citizens. They are generally better farmers than their neighbors. Businessmen have found their integrity unquestionable. They do not offend prevailing concepts of morality.... On the whole, it would be difficult to identify any other ethnic group that has done so little to burden society. If the Amish schools may be outlawed, why not the Amish communities? If it is permissible to live as an Amishman in the United States, why is it not equally permissible to prepare to live as an Amishman?" Ibid. More findings: principles!

We have never seen fit to admit more than one reason for the existence of public (hence, generalized, common, essential) schools in our nation: the self-protection of the state, even as the same requirement calls for a community to establish a fire department and police protection. "Assuming the state must protect itself, one consideration is basic: Does the Amish educational approach represent anything more than the reasonable discretion of parents? Does it preclude anything plainly essential to good citizenship or include anything manifestly inimical to the general welfare? Since the recipients of Amish schooling function so well in the Amish communities and the larger society suffers no significant threat in the process, the answer must be no." Ibid.

The child's freedom of choice is important. But what public school is a free forum in which a child may choose his religion, economics, or politics today? To date its religion has been the common-denominator indifferent kind; its economics is almost wholly Keynesian; and its politics is a preparation for life in a socialized state. A book-size writing would be necessary to document this. "What agency of the state, then, may be trusted to select an educational format so superior or allegedly neutral that it may be imposed on every child? The destinies of the young will often be misguided by parents, but this state of affairs seems far less lethal than the alternative of giving government the ultimate power of indoctrination." Ibid. We stand or fall with the Amish. This we should find if we read thoughtfully. "It is sometimes argued...that the nation would be better off if all cultural backwaters, religious enclaves, and social classes were eliminated.... It is one thing, however, to forbid invidious distinctions in public functions and quite another to stifle self-determination in private affairs, when the individual infringes no rights of others.... Over the centuries, important contributions have been made by groups that were at such marked variance with the established order as to need some degree of insulation to survive.... The efforts of authorities to enforce, in private spheres, their concepts of the good tend to assume a bloody hue." Ibid. Said the Supreme Court: "Those who begin coercive elimination of dissent soon find themselves exterminating dissenters. Compulsory unification of opinion achieves only the unanimity of the graveyard."

Martin Galstad

---

# **PANORAMA**

---

## **THE DOCUMENTS OF VATICAN II:**

### **AN EXAMINATION**

**(Continued.)**

#### **3. Dogmatic Constitution on the Church.**

The document "De Ecclesia" or "Lumen Gentium" (from the first words of the Latin text) has been designated a dogmatic constitution. This has a special meaning in Roman Catholic circles where this title stands for "the most solemn form of conciliar utterance" and in the present context "sets forth with conciliar authority the Church's present understanding of her own nature." This document is exceeded in length only by the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World. That the subject "De Ecclesia" was considered very important and central to the understanding of other documents was quite evident from the careful treatment given to it. One document (1962) was replaced by another (1963) which in turn underwent revision and change. After lengthy debate it was adopted in its present form on Nov. 21, 1964 by a vote of 2,151 to 5. We may therefore conclude that this is a well considered as well as an up-to-date word of the Roman Church on a subject which has been in controversy ever since the doctrine of the spiritual priesthood

of all believers was submerged by the hierarchy which, to assure its perpetuity, emphasized the external organization with all the ranks and orders descending from the pope in Rome as the infallible head. The council was well aware of the fact that the so-called separated brethren could easily and quickly be alienated if too much emphasis were placed on the hierarchical aspects of the church and in particular if too much were made of the supremacy of the pope. It was well understood that it would not do to operate with the anathemas of the Council of Trent. And so we find a carefully drawn document which, I am sure, is meant on the one hand to pave the way to a better understanding between the higher and lower echelon in the Roman Church itself and on the other hand to attract and pacify those on the outside who have condemned the externalism and the popery of the Church of Rome.

To a marked degree the council fathers have succeeded in casting an image of Biblical orientation and Biblical scholarship. Vivid and Biblical language abounds, and numerous are the references to Holy Scripture. Tradition is seldom referred to in the body of the document, although references to encyclicals and the works of church fathers are in good supply in the footnotes so that the faithful will know that this so-called "sacred deposit of revelation" has not been overlooked. The Church as the flock, as the edifice of God, as the bride, as the body of Christ, is all beautifully set forth. Declarations are in evidence which reject the thought that a mere external connection with the church organization assures a true membership in the one, holy, and apostolic Church. Quotations could be brought which leave the impression that membership

in the Church of God is accorded also to believers outside the Roman Catholic fold. Naturally one reads these portions with reservation since previous assurance has been given that there has been no change in doctrine and that no new doctrines are taught or intended. It is quite easy to understand how the modern ecumenicist who sees what he wants to see may be able to cite quotation after quotation to point up the claim that there has been a change in Rome. But one dare not overlook the fact that the council fathers have, at the cost of considerable pain and effort, made it clear that the infallibility of the pope still stands and that hence all statements in the document are to be understood as being in full agreement with the decrees and canons of previous councils and papal encyclicals. It is safe to say, for instance, that if it were not for the importance of preserving the infallibility of the pope as he has spoken "ex cathedra" on marriage, the long awaited pronouncement on birth control would now be history and the impatient laity and the uncomfortable clergy would breath a sigh of relief. But the immutability of the Roman Church must be preserved at all costs even though certain concessions are made in the interest of "Aggiornamento", bringing things up to date and seeking to place them into a more favorable light by new interpretations and new formulations. So taking the Roman Church at her own word we do not look for new doctrines nor do we look for retraction or change of doctrinal pronouncements, edicts and promulgations of the past.

Consequently we cannot be charged with prejudice or lack of charity or fairness when we interpret the new in the light of the old. But even this is not necessary to convince one that the old heresies



are still present. Take a long look, for instance, at paragraph 8 of De Ecclesia: "Christ, the one Mediator, established and ceaselessly sustains here on earth His holy Church, the community of faith, hope, and charity, as a visible structure. Through her he communicates truth and grace to all. But the society furnished with hierarchical agencies and the Mystical Body of Christ are not to be considered as two realities, nor are the visible assembly and the spiritual community, nor the earthly Church and the Church enriched with heavenly things. Rather they form one interlocked reality which is comprised of a divine and a human element. For this reason, by an excellent analogy, this reality is compared to the mystery of the incarnate Word. Just as the assumed nature inseparably united to the divine Word serves Him as a living instrument of salvation, so, in a similar way, does the communal structure of the Church serve Christ's spirit, who vivified it by way of building up the body (cf. Eph. 4:16). This is the unique Church of Christ which in the creed we avow as one, holy, catholic and apostolic. After His resurrection our Savior handed her over to Peter to be shepherded (Jn. 21:17), commissioning him and the other apostles to propagate and govern her (cf. Mt. 28:18ff.). Her He erected for all ages as 'the pillar and mainstay of the truth' (I Tim. 3:15). This Church, constituted and organized in the world as a society, subsists in the Catholic Church, which is governed by the successor of Peter and by the bishops in union with that successor, although many elements of sanctification and of truth can be found outside of her visible structure. These elements, however, as gifts properly belonging to the Church

of Christ, possess an inner dynamism toward Catholic unity." This quote stands as a good proof of what we have been saying. Rome still looks upon herself as the visible sacrament of saving unity. She still insists that the pope governs and heads the Church by divine right. And the most she will say about anything or anyone outside her visible structure is that here are found elements of sanctification and of truth which however belong to the church of Christ which subsists in the Catholic Church with the pope as the head. She does speak of those outside her visible fold who are honored with the name of Christian and who believe in the Triune God, but always with such qualifications that one is left with the impression of a second-rate type of Christianity which can only come into full bloom by uniting with the Roman Church, called the "Mother Church."

Many sections of the document can be cited to show that there has been no sign of withdrawing the doctrine of the supremacy and infallibility of the pope. Collegiality is a term that has been popularized by the council and some have found in it promise of a mutual sharing of power between pope and bishops. However, this is not to be carried out in any way which interferes with the authority and primacy of the pope. He who thinks that things have changed since the present expansion of Vatican I's treatment of the subject had better take a long look at this significant sentence of paragraph 22: "But the college or body of bishops has no authority unless it is simultaneously conceived of in terms of its head, the Roman Pontiff, Peter's successor, and without any lessening of his power of primacy over all, pastors as well as the general faithful." As regards the doctrine of papal infallibility notice is served

that it stands; and these sentences from paragraph 25 tell the story: "This infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed His Church to be endowed in defining a doctrine of faith and morals extends as far as extends the deposit of divine revelation, which must be religiously guarded and faithfully expounded. This is the infallibility which the Roman Pontiff, the head of the college of bishops, enjoys in virtue of his office, when, as the supreme shepherd and teacher of all the faithful, who confirms his brethren in their faith (cf. Lk. 22:32) he proclaims by a definitive act some doctrine of faith or morals. Therefore his definitions, of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church, are justly styled irreformable, for they are pronounced with the assistance of the Holy Spirit, an assistance promised to him in blessed Peter. Therefore they need no approval of others, nor do they allow an appeal to any other judgment. For then the Roman Pontiff is not pronouncing judgment as a private person. Rather, as the supreme teacher of the universal Church, as one in whom the charism of the infallibility of the Church herself is individually present, he is expounding or defending a doctrine of Catholic faith."

The presentation of the hierarchical structure is followed by a chapter on the Laity which comes as a refreshing breeze after the thick and oppressive air which pervaded the preceding section. The role that the laity may play in the propagation of the Gospel is, by and large, well stated; and one could only rejoice in such activity as is here proposed if assurance could be given that the subject of this mission is indeed the Gospel of free grace in Christ Jesus. As a sample of this section consider the following selections from this chapter and the

following: "They are called there by God so that by exercising their proper function and being led by the spirit of the gospel they can work for the sanctification of the world from within, in the manner of leaven. In this way they can make Christ known to others, especially by the testimony of a life resplendent in faith, hope, and charity.... They show themselves to be children of the promise, if, strong in faith and in hope, they make the most of the present time (cf. Eph. 5; 16; Col. 4:5) and with patience await the glory that is to come (cf. Rom. 8:25). Let them not, then, hide this hope in the depths of their hearts, but even in the framework of secular life let them express it by a continual turning toward God and by wrestling 'against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual forces of wickedness.' (Eph. 6:12).... The followers of Christ are called by God, not according to their accomplishments, but according to His own purpose and grace. They are justified in the Lord Jesus, and through baptism sought in faith they truly become sons of God and sharers in the divine nature. In this way they are really made holy. Then, too, by God's gifts they must hold on to and complete in their lives this holiness which they have received." But the council fathers could not deal with this subject without making clear that there is a fundamental difference between laity and clergy, as witness the following: "With ready Christian obedience, laymen as well as all disciples of Christ should accept whatever their sacred pastors, as representatives of Christ, decree in their role as teachers and rulers in the Church." And again consider the implications of this statement: "Those chosen for the fulness of

the priesthood are gifted with sacramental grace enabling them to exercise a perfect role of pastoral charity through prayer, sacrifice, and preaching, as through every form of a bishop's care and service. "Can you imagine Luther letting this stand? He who insisted so strongly on the spiritual priesthool of all believers would not have tolerated any detraction from its fulness, of that we can be sure. And we can be certain that Peter wouldn't have approved of it either; for to the elect (without distinction of rank) he said: "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light." I Pet. 2:9. Whom will you choose: Peter who wrote by inspiration of God, or the pope who claims to be his successor but "whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved"? II Thess. 2:9.10.

The vows of chastity, poverty, and obedience together with the merits of monastic and cloistered life are exalted and acclaimed. Prayers for the dead and the invocation of saints and particularly of the virgin Mary are specifically enjoined. Purgatory is clearly taught. The final chapter sets forth at great length "the Role of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, in the Mystery of Christ and the Church." While in one place it is stated that "she is one with all human beings in their need for salvation", in other places she is called the "Mother of God entirely holy and free from all stain of sin, fashioned by the Holy Spirit into a kind of new substance and

new creature. Adorned from the first instant of her conception with the splendors of an entirely unique holiness, the Virgin of Nazareth is, on God's command, greeted by an angel messenger as "full of grace" (cf. Lk. 1:28). In opposition to those who were ready to name Mary as co-mediator and practically as the female counterpart of God, such phrases as might alienate the "separated brethren" were largely avoided. They were not, however, entirely purged from the document. While indeed Jesus Christ is confessed as the One Mediator, the role of Mary in the church is placed into such prominence that those who had wanted more to be said would be satisfied. So that a pertinent quotation may be read in its context, we here give the entire paragraph: "This maternity of Mary in the order of grace began with the consent which she gave in faith at the Annunciation and which she sustained without wavering beneath the cross. This maternity will last without interruption until the eternal fulfillment of all the elect. For, taken up to heaven, she did not lay aside this saving role, but by her manifold acts of intercession continues to win for us gifts of eternal salvation. By her maternal charity, Mary cares for the brethren of her Son who still journey on earth surrounded by dangers and difficulties, until they are led to their happy fatherland. Therefore the Blessed Virgin is invoked by the Church under the titles of Advocate, Auxiliatrix, Adjutrix, and Mediatrix. These, however, are to be so understood that they neither take away from nor add anything to the dignity and efficacy of Christ the One Mediator. For no creature could ever be classed with the Incarnate Word and Redeemer. But, just as the priesthood of Christ is shared in various ways both by sacred

ministers and by the faithful, and as the one goodness of God is in reality communicated diversely to His creatures, so also the unique mediation of the Redeemer does not exclude but rather gives rise among creatures to a manifold cooperation which is but a sharing in this unique source. The Church does not hesitate to profess this subordinate role of Mary. She experiences it continuously and commends it to the hearts of the faithful, so that encouraged by this maternal help they may more closely adhere to the Mediator and Redeemer." Paragraph 62.

That "De Ecclesia" should end on a note which exalts the virgin Mary above all the saints and angels is typical of Roman Catholicism and shows the extent of the drift away from the true apostolic and Christian faith. It is hard to understand how any perceptive theologian can find basis for the belief that the papal church has reformed. At least "De Ecclesia", in spite of its many true and Scriptural statements, does not provide any evidence of change. Let him who is inclined to optimism on this score read the whole schema so that all is judged in its proper context.

C. M. Gullerud

A QUOTATION      There is no symbol of corruption in a church more obvious than toleration, for the sake of peace, of the public preaching of false doctrine, as it has become so commonplace today; or the establishment of a formal union which embraces both error and truth in a so-called spirit of charity and meekness. This judg-

ment stands even if such churches are models of good external ecclesiastical order and abound in what men regard as works of love.

Where sound doctrine is at stake, divisive struggle is as much a sign of genuine spiritual life and health in a church as the uncompromising battle against the Old Adam's persistent sinfulness is in the individual Christian. To be at peace here for the sake of peace is to defect from the divine purpose.

A. Brauer  
Von der Heilsgewissheit

TIME ON        It is characteristic of TIME Magazine  
LUTHER        that in this year that marks the 450th  
                 anniversary of the Reformation it  
should make its contribution early. It is also characteristic that its research has been thorough and its range of observation so wide that it includes statements by men of almost every shade of the theological spectrum. But what strikes this writer most forcibly on re-reading their cover story of March 24th is how few of those professional theologians and churchmen come even close to understanding Luther, while a layman, a journalist working for a secular news magazine, seems to know him much better. The research and interviews are staff work, of course. But the article in its final form is the work of one man, anonymous, but presumably the chief of the section on religion.



While most of the opinions quoted are complimentary, this is not true of all. By some strange twist of Communist logic members of the Ulbricht regime in East Germany claim that Luther is to be regarded as a spiritual forerunner of Marxism! And in the typically psycho-analytical manner of modern "historical" drama Osborne's LUTHER presents the reformer as "a manic-depressive lout, whose rebellion against the Church was motivated by a father fixation and a bad case of constipation." -- But these are the exceptions. Catholic spokesmen of today seem to have turned their backs on the slanderous writings of Grisar and his kind and are outdoing themselves in their efforts to be openminded and complimentary. The Jesuit John Courtney Murray pays tribute to Luther, calling him "a religious genius -- compassionate, rhetorical and full of insights." Another concedes with unusual candor that Luther's position on indulgences was right, and prefers the reformer's teachings on justification to those of Thomas Aquinas. Then there is also the Anglican bishop who speaks kindly of Luther's "basic insight" into justification by faith, but demonstrates his up-to-dateness by basing his approval on the fact that "this fits in very closely with the findings of many psychologists," -- useful, therefore, in cases calling for psychiatric treatment. Other opinions are quoted, in considerable number.

But it is the "representatives" of Lutheranism who disappoint one most. First and most frequently quoted in the article is Jaroslav Pelikan, formerly of Concordia - St. Louis, now church historian at Yale. To him the Reformation was "a tragic necessity." In another context (that hardly

a U.S. church exists without a frightening quota of red tape and organizational concern) he is quoted as saying that "the Law of Moses may have been abrogated, but not Parkinson's." But when the subject of justification comes up and attempts are made to translate Luther's doctrine into "contemporary terms," Pelikan seems to fall in line with the others who relate it to the area of modern psychiatry: "there is some relevance! to a thought whose entire concern is how to cope with guilt, anxiety and fear." Martin Marty, who is usually quoted for his ardent defense and practice of inter-denominationalism, shows at least some Lutheran color by charging American Christianity with abandoning the primacy of faith for a Social Gospelite program of church-instigated "good works." Franklin Clark Fry, President of the Lutheran Church in America, finds his "contemporary terms" in the vocabulary of philosophy, saying that a proper interpretation of Luther's teaching is that faith must find its "existential expression" in service. A similarly existential term is quoted from Paul Tillich, that Luther possessed "the courage to be," that life for him was "an existential risk," etc. And as a final sample we take this statement by Carl Braaten of Chicago's Lutheran School of Theology, who claims that Protestant union is precisely in accord with the reformer's wishes. He is quoted as saying: "The Reformation was always meant to be a temporary movement. When the Roman Catholic Church is reformed, there will be no justification for a separate Protestant Church."

It is a faint and pallid picture of Luther and his work that these men have drawn up for the world to behold. But it is a pleasure, by way of contrast,

to see the real Luther emerging as in the course of his article the author makes his own observations from time to time. He speaks of Luther's early "efforts to solve the most fundamental of Christian problems, man's relationship to God." He refers to Luther's "profound sense of his own sinfulness." Concerning the answer that finally emerged (that man is saved solely by grace, through faith alone) he says that this is a doctrine "as old as Paul's," but adds "that Luther's particular framing of it came precisely at the right moment." And he tells the story of the finding of the solution in Luther's own words: "Night and day I pondered, until I saw the connection between the justice of God and the statement that 'the just shall live by faith.' Then I grasped that the justice of God is that righteousness by which, through grace and sheer mercy, God justifies us through faith. Thereupon I felt myself to be reborn and to have gone through open doors into paradise."

After this sampling of the author's study of Luther one feels that what he says by way of introducing his reference to the climactic scene at Worms (Luther's "Here I stand") is not mere superficial hero worship or an expression of admiration for an outstanding example of bold courage and firm conviction. It is an indication of understanding, profound understanding, both of the weakness of our time and the strength that was Luther's when he says: "But Luther does not offer to the church any easy, adaptable solutions to Christian troubles. What he presents is something more: the exemplar of what a man of faith can and must be. In a dark age ob-

sessed by pain and trouble, Luther was, above all an 'Easter Christian, ' dominated by the memory and promise of Resurrection, the hope implicit in God's word."

To which we add: "This is LUTHER!"

E. Reim

A QUOTATION      The doctrine of inspiration is not a theological island; it is inseparably linked with a confession of the formal principle. A total confusion of all fundamental theological concepts must have been suffered by any man who feels able to call himself an evangelical theologian while he pays homage to the prevalent superstition which disavows the distinctive, divine origin of Holy Scripture and demotes it to the level of an essentially human book. . . . The Reformers liberated theology from the ex cathedra of Rome; not, however, in order to subject it to a second human tribunal consisting of a given majority of professors, but solely for the purpose of making theology subservient to the divine authority of the written Word of God.

W. Koelling

## SUMMER SEMINAR FOR PASTORS

July 31 to August 4

PROGRAM

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Lecturer</u>
Homiletics	C. M. Gullerud
Biblical Hermeneutics in the light of the Reformation	E. Schaller
Luther as pastor of the humble and the great in the 1520's	R. Gurgel
Geography, Topography and Scenes of the Holy Land	E. Albrecht
Review of "The Structure of Lutheranism," by W. Ehlert	L. Schierenbeck

.....

STATISTICS

Four 1 1/2-hour lectures per day for five days.

First lecture at 8:00 A. M.

Costs:

1. Board and room: \$16.50
2. Meals for those who will live off campus:  
Dinners \$1.00  
Suppers .60.

REGISTRATION REQUESTED BY OR BEFORE JUNE  
15. Seminar Registration, Immanuel Luth. College,  
Grover Rd., Eau Claire, Wis. 54701

---

# C O N T E N T S

---

VOLUME 7

MAY 1967

NUMBER 2

PREFACE: 1967 .....	1
The Editor	
HOW GOD PREPARED THE WORLD FOR THE REFORMATION .....	2
C. M. Gullerud	
THE PENTATEUCH AND ITS CRITICS .....	14
E. Schaller	
<u>PAIDEIA</u>	
MORE FINDINGS .....	23
M. Galstad	
<u>PANORAMA</u>	
THE DOCUMENTS OF VATICAN II: AN EXAMINATION .....	29
C. M. Gullerud	
TIME ON LUTHER .....	39
E. Reim	
NOTICE: PASTORS' INSTITUTE .....	44

The Journal of Theology is published at Eau Claire, Wisconsin, by authorization of the Church of the Lutheran Confession. Subscriptions are payable in advance. The rate is \$3.00 per year (\$5.50 for two years) for five issues: March, May, July, October and December. Editorial Staff: C. M. Gullerud; R. Gurgel; E. Reim; E. Schaller. Contributing Editors: M. Galstad; G. Radtke. All correspondence, including subscriptions, renewals and changes of address, should be directed to the Editor, Prof. E. Schaller, 513 W. Grover Rd., Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701.

---