



"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**

---



---

# ==ESSAYS AND ARTICLES==

## LUTHER AND THE FORTY-SIXTH PSALM

As we give special consideration to the current 450th anniversary of the Reformation, the 46th Psalm calls for our particular attention. Its sturdy affirmation of faith, its powerful demonstration of what it means that God is in the midst of His people, its positive assurance of final victory — all this was a source of comfort and strength on which Luther drew again and again. It is said that when things would look particularly bad and Luther would find himself correspondingly low in spirits he would say to Melanchthon, "Come, let us sing the 46th Psalm." And sing it they did, first probably according to the Latin text and the traditional chant, then with added vigor and joy in the form that Luther gave it when he wrote the hymn that since has come to be known as the Battle Hymn of the Reformation, "A Mighty Fortress is Our God."

The entire text indicates that this hymn was born in a period of crisis. The date of its publication, 1529, shows the nature and the cause of this crisis: the events leading up to the Imperial Diet of Spires (Speier). Serious though the situation was, this was not the first experience of that kind for Luther. Nine years before, facing a newly crowned Emperor, Charles V, together with the assembled dignitaries of the Empire, Luther stood at Worms, confronted with their demand that he retract what he had written and taught. His famous "Here I stand" was the climax of a situation where it seemed not only that his cause would be lost, but that he himself must perish. The fate of Hus, burnt under similar circumstances a century before, was still too vivid to be forgotten. But God willed otherwise. The powers that had threatened to crush Luther began falling out with each other. Soon the Emperor was at war with the King of France, eventually with the Pope as well. Luther was safe and the Reformation was spreading far and

wide. But then, like Pilate and Herod of old, these latter-day enemies became friends. Now definite steps were being taken to put an end to what they called the German heresy. Speier promised to become a second Worms. The Diet did in fact re-enact the infamous Edict of Worms, the decree which had at that time outlawed both Luther and Lutheranism. Though Luther was not at Speier to speak for himself, five Lutheran Princes and the heads of fourteen cities that had embraced the Reformation were there and spoke out in the famous Protest of Speier, thereby to go down in history as the original Protestants.

Again the prospects were grim; but once more God intervened. Though Speier was bad and Augsburg was still to come, particularly the latter was to prove a blessing rather than a disaster. The Augsburg Confession was its fruit. — This time it was the Turks who stayed the hand of the Emperor with their invasion of Austria and siege of Vienna, while Luther and his followers could sing their "Mighty Fortress" with ever greater faith and confidence.

In view of all this it seems strange that the hymn does not come closer to reproducing the specific wording of the Psalm. Neither the title nor the opening lines are a direct quotation of the actual text. Yet there is an undeniable similarity, even as to the historical background of the Psalm. While commentators debate whether the events to which it refers are to be found in the happenings recorded in II Chronicles 20 (during the reign of Jehoshaphat) or in what is told concerning the reign of Hezekiah in chapter 32 of the same book (see also Isaiah 36 and 37), we prefer to think that the latter does not exclude the former, even though almost two centuries lay between. It simply means that God had twice shown the people of Jerusalem that though their own strength was utterly inadequate for their defense, their true help was in Jehovah, the Lord of Hosts. In the first instance the triple alliance of Moab, Ammon and the people of Mount Seir had come apart so that they turned their swords against each other, thoroughly eliminating the threat they had created. In the second the Angel of the Lord had destroyed a

powerful army of Assyrians, forcing Sennacherib, their proud and blasphemous king, to retreat to the fancied safety of his capital city, only there to meet death at the hands of his own sons. Such is the situation of which the Psalm speaks and which it illustrates with the poetic imagery of raging seas, quaking mountains, and with its vivid description of a battlefield where a proud foe had met such humiliating defeat.

Luther's love for this Psalm shows that he must have been conscious of the parallel between that situation and his own. Yet there were differences also, differences too clear to be ignored. Jerusalem's foes were men of flesh and blood, their weapons the conventional armory of war. Luther recognized the different nature of the powers with which he had to deal:

Though devils all the world should fill,  
They shall not overpower us.

He knew who really ruled those papal prelates, those princely puppets. Not the "Holy Father" at Rome, not His Imperial Majesty, Charles V, but rather:

The old evil Foe  
Now means deadly woe;  
Deep guile and great might  
Are his dread arms in fight;  
On earth is not his equal.

But not only did Luther know the true nature of his foes. He knew himself as well, his own weakness and that of all his friends;

With might of ours can naught be done,  
Soon were our loss effected.

Most important, however, is that he knew his true source of help:

But for us fights the Valiant One  
Whom God Himself elected.  
Ask ye, Who is this?  
Jesus Christ it is,  
Of Sabaoth Lord,  
And there's none other God;  
He holds the field forever.

Also he knew his one true and effective weapon, of which he could say:

One little word can fell him

and to which he could add:

The Word they still shall let remain  
Nor any thanks have for it.

Other parts of the hymn could be quoted to the same effect. Luther certainly did not lack the ability to translate Hebrew poetry into his native German, and still have it come out as true poetry! Witness his hymn on Psalm 130, "From Depths of Woe . . ." (L.H. #329). But what he did in the case of "A Mighty Fortress" was not merely to translate the Psalm into German, but rather to translate it into the situation of his day, into the hard and cold facts of life as it confronted him and his followers. The need was for something to give courage and strength, an infusion of that sturdy faith and bold confidence to which particularly the first verse of the Psalm gives such vigorous expression. All Christendom knows how well he succeeded. More than ever, in our late day, we need just that kind of assurance, lest our courage fail. And we find it, both in the Psalm and hymn.

The metrical version which follows is offered with more than our usual degree of trepidation. The idea is not to match Luther's matchless hymn, but rather to supplement it by trying to capture in verse form as much as possible of the imagery which is so characteristic of Old Tes-

tament poetry and in which this Psalm is so particularly rich. The first line of our translation is Luther's, taken over verbatim. This is done in order to aid in a more specific identification of the hymn with the Psalm. It also implies an acknowledgment of our dependence on Luther. And finally it is meant as a sincere tribute to Luther's skill as a translator, demonstrated here by his ability to render the basic thoughts of the original, in prose as well as in poetic form, and doing so without repeating himself even a little.

As for the formal arrangement of thought, we have used the untranslatable SELAH to indicate the major divisions. The first part, verses 1 to 3, is clearly intended to sound the keynote, the great theme of the Psalm. It is a shout of encouragement in a scene of wildest tumult. The second (vv. 4-7) shows by way of vivid contrast a beautiful picture of the peace and comfort God's people enjoy because of His presence in their midst. The reminder of hostile forces is still there, but they are overruled by God's almighty power. The third part (vv. 8-11) is an invitation to see this power in action, to measure it by what it has wrought. This is what Jerusalem was given to see in its hours of crisis. This is what all subsequent history teaches. The heathen rage, but God rules!

One final observation concerning the distinctive names of God as they are used in this Psalm. In general it is that name which emphasizes God's majesty and power, ELOHIM. But in the refrains ("the Lord of Hosts is with us" — vv. 7a and 11a) we see that name of God which emphasizes His covenant faithfulness, JEHOVAH, in this case coupled with SABAOTH, the Lord of Hosts. He is the one who has all the powers of heaven at His command, and He uses them in faithful fulfillment of His promise. This appears with particular clarity when we consider the use of that name in verse 8, "Come now, and see Jehovah's wondrous deeds . . ." What was at stake when Jerusalem was threatened in those ancient days was actually the continued existence of that nation from which SHILOH should come, the Prince of Peace. Therefore the foes of those days had to be destroyed. Even

though Jerusalem must be laid waste and Judah go into exile for their apostasy and unbelief, another empire had to be overthrown so that the exiles could return. For God had preserved a Remnant for Himself! JEHOVAH was still the Covenant God! Or, as Luther put it,

"The Kingdom ours remaineth."

E. Reim

\* \* \* \*

### PSALM XLVI

(Translation by E. R.)

- 1) A mighty Fortress is our God, a trusty Shield  
and Weapon,  
A Helper true in all distress, One ready to be  
found.
- 2) Therefore let fear be gone, though earth may  
change;  
Though hills do slide into the deepest sea;
- 3) Though waves may roar and wildly break  
And mountains quake before the storm-swept  
tide.

### SELAH

- 4) But here are stream and springs, God's City  
to refresh:  
The Holy Place, where dwells the One Most  
High,
- 5) God's in her midst — she'll not be overthrown;  
Her help will come from God when darkness  
turns to dawn.
- 6) The nations moan, kingdoms must rise and fall;  
The very earth dissolves when He sends forth  
His voice.
- 7) Yet see — the Lord of Hosts, He is with us!

The God of Jacob: Rock where we may safely  
stand.

SELAH

- 8) Come now, and see Jehovah's wondrous deeds,  
What desolations He hath laid upon the land.
- 9) In all the earth, 'tis He who makes the wars to  
cease!  
The bow — He breaks it, as He wrecks the  
spear;  
The chariots He burns with fire.
- 10) Be still, and know that I am God:  
Among the nations I'll exalted be;  
Exalted will I be in all the earth.
- 11) The Lord of Hosts is with us yet!  
The God of Jacob: Rock where we may safely  
stand.

SELAH



The JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY is published at Eau Claire,  
Wisconsin, by authorization of the Church of the Lutheran  
Confession.

Subscriptions: \$3.00 per year, \$5.50 for 2 years, pay-  
able in advance.

Issues are dated: March, May, July, October, December.

Editor: Prof. E. Schaller, 513 W. Grover Rd., Eau  
Claire, Wisconsin, 54701.

Editorial Staff: C. M. Gullerud, R. Gurgel, E. Reim.

Contributing Editors: M. Galstad, G. Radtke.

All correspondence, including subscriptions, renewals and  
changes of address, should be directed to the Editor.

## HOW GOD PREPARED THE WORLD FOR THE REFORMATION (Concluded)

### III.

There had been an urgent need for a Reformation long before the advent of Luther. As human authority with its ecclesiasticism and rank gained ground, the lordship of Christ and the authority of Scripture were pushed aside. With the hierarchy forming and solidifying its power the way was open to every form of error and ungodliness that appealed to the proud and self-seeking flesh. The people were held in ignorance in order that the hierarchy might retain its hold on them. How things were building up to the point where a reformation was necessary was recognized not only by Luther but by many others. Because of its lack of spirituality the Roman Church reached the point where its worship and rites could be characterized by that well-known Latin expression Ex Opere Operato. Rome taught that worship and rites were effective even though they were engaged in only externally. In the wake of all this came the long list of errors and abuses -- the pilgrimages, the penances, the indulgences, the saint worship, the relic worship, vigils, and mariolatry. Masses could be purchased (even on the installment plan) as a protection against every manner of ill. Indulgences took the place of repentance. The doctrine of justification with its message of free and full forgiveness through the merits and atonement of Jesus Christ was pushed aside in favor of a part-grace and part-works doctrine. This was used by unscrupulous men to bring large sums of money into the coffers of the church. The result was that souls were left with nothing but dry husks to satisfy their most urgent needs. Endless efforts to appease the wrath of God brought nothing but uncertainty and ultimate despair. That many of the priests and monks and popes led scandalous lives was an open secret. Even Catholic historians who wish to stay with the facts admit that the Roman Church was ripe for a purging.

Since this deterioration was a gradual process and was

in evidence long before the Reformation, it is of value to consider what kind of reactions manifested themselves in earlier years. In these reactions we see the hand of God active in making preparations for the Reformation. In this connection our attention is drawn to a few men who have been called fore-runners of the Reformation. While it may be difficult to assess the effects of the testimony of these men since no reformation resulted, yet it is apparent that there was a ground-swell of opposition to the errors and abuses of the Roman Church; and as this gained momentum the way was being readied for the appearance of Luther through whom the Lord set in motion the Reformation with its many blessings of which we are heirs. We go back to a man named John Wycliffe of England (1324-1384) who has been called "the morning star of the Reformation." Though erring on the Lord's Supper and tending to synergism in connection with the sanctification of the Christian, he took such a stand against the Roman Church that he is remembered as one of the stalwart forerunners of the Reformation. Wycliffe took a determined stand against transubstantiation, purgatory, the primacy of the pope (he called him the anti-christ), enforced celibacy, and enforced auricular confession. He contended for the separation of church and state and opposed the pope's meddling in English affairs of state and church. It was because of the latter that he was called to stand trial before the ecclesiastical courts. Indeed, many years later Dr. Eck was unwittingly to honor the memory of Wycliffe when, in the Leipzig Debate, he classified him with Luther because of his rejection of the primacy of the pope. Wycliffe was responsible for the first complete English Bible which he issued in 1382, a translation of the Latin Vulgate. He had stirred up such a fire that 31 years after his death he was officially excommunicated by the Council of Constance. As if this were not enough, his bones were burned and the ashes strewn into the Swift 13 years later. There is no doubt that Luther made use of Wycliffe's translation of the Bible in connection with his own work of translating and certainly our English Bible shows definite points of contact with it. Schwiebert in his book "Luther and His Times" lists John Wycliffe with the

men by whom Luther was influenced during his residency in the monastery at Erfurt. Among other things he says: "Certainly, Luther's later break with the Papacy was made much easier by the fact that many educated men all over Europe had come to similar conclusions before his time."

A well-known disciple of Wycliffe was John Hus (1373?-1415), a native of Bohemia. With great courage he denounced popish errors and the immorality of the clergy and of the laity. Hus supported Scripture as the sole authority and affirmed that adherence to the pope was not essential to salvation. Regarding the Church he taught that it is the body of the elect. Although preaching Christ as the only Savior, he erred in giving some place to works in the justification of the sinner. Opposition became so hot that Prague was put under the interdict and Hus himself was put under the curse of the ban. Finally on July 6, 1415, he was burned at the stake while making the confession, "In the truth of the Gospel, which I have written, taught and preached, I will die today with gladness." Years later Luther was to give him this honor: "In John Hus the Holy Ghost was very powerful." (Hus' great interest in the propagation of the Holy Scriptures is shown by his work on the revision of the old Bohemian version of the Bible.) When the Bohemian schism became an issue at the Leipzig Debate, Dr. Eck, pulling at every straw in order to discredit Luther, called him "patron of the Hussites." The Great Reformer himself gave Hus all the credit due him without associating himself with his errors.

We now mention the name of the humanist Johann Wessel (ca 1419-1489) because of his prominent association with the Brethren of the Common Life. This group deserves mention because of its dedication to the study of Holy Scripture, its promotion of public education, and its activity in the circulation of good books at a time when these were all but banned by the papal church. The Brethren of the Common Life, an association of pious priests and laymen, was founded ca. 1384. Its members were largely mystics who emphasized "Christ in us" rather than

"Christ for us." While this movement did not effect a reformation it did represent an early effort to bring Scripture back into its own. It also represented a reaction against what commonly went under the name of monasticism.

Reactions against papal authority and against its work righteousness moved in closer to Rome as Jerome Savonarola (1452-1498), a Dominican monk, took up the cudgels. His activity centered in Florence where he laid down some good testimony in rejecting salvation through works and in upholding salvation by grace alone, with good works flowing only as a fruit of faith. Savonarola did not hesitate to rebuke the sins of the secular rulers and of the pope. He did make the mistake of setting himself up as a divinely appointed reformer not only of the church but also of the state. He died the death of a martyr at the hands of an angry mob which accused him of being a demagog and a heretic. At his death Savonarola expressed his cheerful trust in Christ Jesus Who died for his sins. Luther especially set great store by a treatise which Savonarola had written while in prison. It was an exposition of Psalm 51 which Luther republished "because he considered it an example of evangelical doctrine and Christian piety."

While there are those who would accord to Erasmus of Rotterdam the title of "the forerunner of the Reformation," this is giving him more credit than he deserves. For it must be said that while he did see many of the abuses current in the papacy and did indeed write against them ("Julius Excluded," "The Praise of Folly,") he was at best a vacillating character in spite of all his brilliance. Had he followed consistently the testimony contained in many of his writings, he could have done much good; but instead Erasmus lent his services to the Roman cause by writing the treatise De Libero Arbitrio (Of Free Will). Luther's answer to this learned treatise was the well-known De Servo Arbitrio (The Bondage of the Will) of which Luther said that, if he should wish any of his books to survive, he would choose this one together with the Catechism. No, we

are not ready to number Erasmus of Rotterdam with the forerunners of the Reformation, although we shall grant that his Greek New Testament and some of his writings contributed to the cause. We say even this last with some reservation since the value of such satire as Erasmus used may be open to question. In fact, some of Erasmus' works were of such a nature that Luther is quoted as saying: "On my deathbed I shall forbid my sons to read Erasmus' Colloquies." But then, as now, such censures served only to increase the sale of the book.

We have now reached the dawn of the Reformation. All things have been shaped and molded by the hand of the almighty God in such a way that the Reformation initiated by Dr. Martin Luther should serve the true church of God. How well God had prepared His servant Luther for the mighty task that lay before him does not lie within the scope of this paper. Suffice it to say that the directing hand of God was clearly discernible in the life of that great man of God. In conclusion we let Luther speak in the words of one of his great hymns:

Had God not come, may Israel say,  
Had God not come to aid us,  
Our enemies on that sad day  
Would surely have dismayed us;  
A remnant now, and handful small,  
Held in contempt and scorn by all,  
Who cruelly would oppress us.

Their furious wrath, did God permit  
Would quickly have consumed us,  
And in the deep and yawning pit  
With life and limb entombed us;  
Like men o'er whom dark waters roll,  
The streams had gone e'en o'er our soul,  
And mightily o'erwhelmed us.

Thanks be to God, who from the pit  
Snatched us, when it was gaping;

Our souls, like birds that break the net,  
 To the blue sky escaping;  
 The snare is broken — we are free!  
 The Lord our helper praised be,  
 The God of earth and heaven. Amen.

C. M. Gullerud

## THE PENTATEUCH AND ITS CRITICS

(Presenting, in much abbreviated and free form, a concluding excerpt of the work being translated. For full investigation we refer the reader again to Lehre und Wehre, Vol. 49.)

### IV.

Any array of Biblical witnesses for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch would be incomplete without a listing of certain passages which are, in a sense, the most compelling and decisive. We refer to the clear and unambiguous pronouncements of the New Testament, the words of the true Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, and those of His inspired Apostles.

It would far exceed the range of this essay were we to attempt to cite for consideration all relevant passages of this nature. There are, after all, more than sixty references to Deuteronomy alone in the New Testament. Events, of history from the creation to the death of Moses, recorded in the Pentateuch, are taken up and discussed in the New Testament. These include not merely occurrences which are especially significant for the story of salvation, but such minor moments and items as the ass that spoke to Ba-

laam (2 Pet. 2:15f) and the adornment of Sarah (1 Pet. 3:6).

But we must limit ourselves to the selection of passages in which the name of Moses is expressly associated with a portion of the Pentateuch. And we begin our search in the Gospels. In Matt. 8:4 (Mark 1:44; Luke 5:14) Jesus says to the leper: "... go thy way, show thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded ...", referring him to a passage in Leviticus, a book violently attacked by the modern critics (Lev. 14:2). In Matt. 19:7f (Mark 10:3ff) the Pharisees ask the Lord: "Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement ...?" In thus referring to Deut. 24:1 the Pharisees indicate that they, too, regarded Moses as author of the Law, the Thora; and that meant, the written Law, as the context indicates (v. 4, "have ye not read ..."). Whereupon Jesus replied: "Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so."

In Mark 7:10 words of Jesus to the Pharisees and Scribes are again quoted: "For Moses said, Honor thy father and thy mother; and, Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death." This time the quotation came from Exodus (20:12). Now if in this and the above passages it is claimed only that Moses ordered, commanded, permitted or said, there are others which affirm that Moses wrote. Even the parallel passage for Matt. 19:8, namely Mark 10:4, quotes Jesus as saying to the Pharisees: "For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept." The Sadducees, who also regarded Moses as the writer of the Pentateuch, are heard in Mark 12:19 (Luke 20:28; Matt. 22:24) saying to Jesus: "Master, Moses wrote unto us, If a man's brother die, and leave his wife behind him, and leave no children, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother." Thus they cited Deut. 25:5. And a few verses later (v. 26) we hear Jesus saying: "And as touching the dead, that they rise: have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?" Here again the Lord refers to Exodus (3:6),

but designates the entire work of five parts, the Thora, as "book of Moses."

In Luke 16:29.31 Abraham is heard speaking to Dives in torment, saying: "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them." "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." The expression "the prophets" denoted the writings of the prophets of which a portion, called a haphthara, was read in synagogue worship each sabbath. In like manner the expression "hearing Moses" reflected the reading of the book of Moses, the Pentateuch, which had been divided into fifty-four pericopes, or parashas, for use on the sabbath day (cp. Luke 4:16f.). On the road to Emmaus the risen Savior, "beginning at Moses and all the prophets," expounded to the two disciples "in all the scriptures the things concerning himself" (Luke 24:27). Like the prophets, then, Moses had left written material in which he prophesied of Christ. And on the evening of the same day the Lord said to the assembled disciples: "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me." "Then he opened their understanding that they might understand the scriptures" (Luke 24:24-25).

Testimony of similar preciseness and clarity confronts us also in the fourth Gospel. Here we find Philip saying to Nathanael: "We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph" (John 1:45). These words contain a threefold affirmation. First, that Moses wrote; secondly, that he wrote the Law, the well-known Thora, namely the Pentateuch; thirdly, that in this law he wrote of Christ. The most emphatic testimony, perhaps, is that found in the fifth chapter of John, where Jesus is cited as saying to the Jews: "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me" (John 5:45ff). We quote a tren-

chant comment from a lengthy exposition of this text:

"The whole point of this argument lies in its contrasting of the two individuals: Moses, who speaks to the Jews out of the past in his writings, and Jesus, who speaks to them orally in the present. The former is the great authority; and thus his writings are vested with an authority which the Jews recognize and to which they profess their subjection. Jesus, on the other hand, is their insignificant contemporary to whose words they concede no authority whatever. But his words would have to become binding upon them if in fact they believed the writings of Moses. For the words and person of Jesus were authenticated by the authority of Moses in his writings.

"In plain words, therefore, Jesus is saying that those documents which lay claim to Mosaic authority, namely the Pentateuch with all its Messianic content, in fact originated with Moses; and that in consequence of this certainty the Pentateuch gives Him, Jesus, the right to demand recognition for the full authority of His words, since he is secured in their judgment by the full authority of Moses. In brief: Moses is the author of the Pentateuch. Only because that is a fact may Jesus here require of the Jews that they believe Him." (Rupprecht, "Solution of the Riddle").

To these testimonies of the Lord and his evangelists concerning the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch we append a few expressions from the other New Testament books, although here too we cannot include all general references.

After the healing of the lame man Peter says to the multitude: "For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me: him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you." So Peter quotes the well-known messianic prophecy, Deut. 18:15. Stephen does the same in his address to the Council, Acts 7:37. In Acts 15:21 we hear James' comment on the sabbath lections from the Pentateuch: "For Moses of old time hath in every city them

that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day."

St. Paul's position in the matter is clear from numerous expressions. Before Felix he confesses that he believes "all things which are written in the law and in the prophets." (Acts 24:14). And that he did not regard the Pentateuch as the product of an anonymous scribe is manifest from his words to Festus and Agrippa: "I continue unto this day witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come" (Acts 26:22).

How frequently did not the great Apostle cite the Pentateuch in evidence in his Epistle to the Romans. And he became very specific: "For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law ..." (Rom. 10:5); and then he quoted Lev. 18:5. Likewise in Corinthians. "Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn" (1 Cor. 9:9) is a quote from Deut. 25:4, concerning which Paul says: "It is written in the law of Moses." In the first ten verses of chapter 10 of First Corinthians he reaches back to Exodus and Numbers; and in 2 Corinthians he remarks about the Thora: "Even unto this day, when Moses is read, the vail is upon their hearts" (3:15).

Finally, we refer to a passage in Hebrews which because of its levitical content is especially relevant. We read in Heb. 9:19: "For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people." This is a reference to the procedure described in Exodus 24:5ff; and it confirms the reference of that passage to an existing book, namely the so-called book of the covenant written by Moses, Ex. 24:4.7.

How does this overwhelming evidence for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch strike the negative critics? No extensive review of their reactions is necessary or desirable

here; for at this point the issue is joined in such a manner that there is little room for evasive circumlocutions. Herman Strack, in an article in the Herzog-Plitt "Realencyclopaedie" simply says: "We must protest against the introduction of New Testament references . . . because, if they prove anything at all, then no further proofs are necessary and any adducing of other evidence would constitute a denigration of the evidence which is based upon the authority of the Lord and His Apostles. Moreover, by the listing of New Testament witnesses the argument has been shifted from a critical-historical basis to the field of dogmatics." In his "Introduction," then, Strack continues the matter with a plaintive cry: "What person who has but a moderately clear concept of the difficulty and complexity of the problems raised by Biblical criticism can seriously believe that those problems could be actually and absolutely resolved by reference to the manner in which the New Testament quotes the Pentateuch? We simply must conclude that in the questions of literary criticism we may not appeal to New Testament references. Even if we assume that the Savior, whose knowledge in the State of Humiliation was not absolute (Mark 13:32), did indeed know precisely how each book of the Old Testament originated, he could not, without diverting attention from the chief issue and thus seriously impairing the solemn purpose of his instruction, have spoken like this: 'In the Law, which you correctly regard as divine but incorrectly regard as having been composed by Moses personally in its present form, it is written . . .'"

The protest of Aug. Koehler of Erlangen ("Lehrbuch der Biblischen Geschichte Alten Testaments") is hardly less inglorious: "It is a fact which, though trivial, cannot be overemphasized, that Jesus did not come into the world for the purpose of instructing people in matters pertaining to natural human affairs, but exclusively in order to make of sinners children of God. Thus his assignment did not include the task of giving instruction in the course of Israel's history as such or in the question of the human origin of those source materials from which this history is derived, but simply called upon him to direct men to the well-

springs of divine revelation and on occasion to present God's revelations from these sources."

Dr. S. Davidson puts the matter this way: "Christ did not meddle with critical questions connected with the Old Testament, as his mission was of another character; He simply acquiesced in the current views of such questions as long as they did not affect the nature of His mission." Prof. W. H. Bennett is less formal. In the "Expositor," Vol. 11, p. 143, he writes: "Imagine someone — singularly lacking all sense of fitness or proportion — asking Christ or St. Paul: 'Are we to understand that it is part of your inspired message that every word in the current text of the Book of Isaiah was written by that prophet, and every word in the Pentateuch by Moses? You claim to speak in God's name, and you say you are inspired by His Spirit, do you stake your authority on the exact and literal accuracy of your language in these matters?' One can imagine Christ's indignant answer. 'Man,' He said once, 'who made me a divider or ruler?' 'Man,' He might have answered, 'who made me a higher critic?'"

We reply to such blasphemy with another question framed in the words of Dr. Howard Crosby:

"Imagine, if you can, the Messiah, in selecting the fittest words to meet Satan's assault, taking up a fragment of a forged book, a book which was a stupendous lie, framed by priestcraft!"

E. Schaller



## **==PREACHING THE WORD==**

### **DO-IT-YOURSELF EXEGESIS FOR THE PARSONAGE STUDY**

Is it sufficient that the Old and New Testament exegesis be a required study in our seminaries? Or shall it also be expected that the parish pastor as well as the language scholar continue the full use of Biblical exegesis in their weekly sermon preparation and for all other Scripture-based teaching situations?

It is taken for granted among us that Biblical exegesis is a **MUST** for our seminary curriculum. It is also a taken-for-granted fact that we make demands upon our Hebrew and Greek scholars to supply us with the translation, exposition and elucidation of Holy Scripture in the original tongues in conference papers, theological journals and books.

What may not be taken for granted is that every seminary graduate will continue to practice sound exegetical discipline in the basic preparation of his sermons and all those lessons and lectures which have sola Scriptura as a major premise.

It would be both sad and embarrassing were we to copy into print some of the inexcusable excuses offered out of the side of the mouth with a wink of the eye whereby confession is made that our work in the Hebrew (and/or Greek) never survived the transit from seminary to parsonage study.

We may have been momentarily jolted out of our language lethargy when we were forced to wrestle with the Hebrew or Greek in the preparation of a conference paper; but the result was really not more than a tepid, second-hand, borrowed presentation.

We may have attempted to salve our conscience by

"looking at" the original text (whenever we had the time) before grinding it through our homiletical machine — but the "looking at" became less frequent and often no more than a vacant stare.

For some of us it may have been a secret conviction that it's too late to begin or resume serious Hebrew and Greek exegesis in our parsonage studies. And it may have become a public confession (at least to the brethren) in those famous last words: "After all, do you know how many years have passed since I was at the sem?"

We hold high our divine call whereby God Himself has made us His heralds. But with how much boldness can we proclaim: "Thus saith the Lord!" if we neglect the gift that was given to us in our seminary training — the gift to interpret from the original language texts? Is it impossible for all but the "crack" language students to continue this sound procedure after graduation? Is it impossible for those of us who are average or low-average Hebrew and Greek students to revive our seminary do-it-yourself exegesis? Is it really too late?

I will be bold to declare it is not impossible to continue it, to revive it — it is NOT too late! Permit me to outline a procedure that worked well for one mediocre language student and permitted him to "stay with it" the many years after graduation. May it stimulate you to do something toward the revival of your do-it-yourself exegesis.

## I

Purchase a bound record book of ample size with narrow ruled paper. On the very first rainy Monday begin early in the day to search out your copies of BIBLIA HEBRAICA and NOVUM TESTAMENTUM GRAECE. Allow yourself a bit of nostalgia as you fondly handle the symbols of gifts you once had and used — perhaps long ago. Gently place them in the center of your study desk, close the door, and open your heart to the Headmaster. Ask anew for the

gift of His Holy Spirit: that you may revive your scholarship in His Word, always remain a student of His Word, and thereby be His faithful witness. Ask for patience, perseverance, progress, and some encouragement — you'll need it all! You are now well equipped to move into your do-it-yourself exegesis.

## II

With the text selected for study before you, take a few minutes for a thoughtful reading of the entire setting of your text. Use your favorite English translation for this. Then pursue a brief isagogical survey concerned with the text and context. Get the panoramic wide-view clearly fixed on your mind's screen — it will help you later when you zoom in on the details. In your bound book where you have titled the page with your text, date, occasion, hymns, etc., you will now jot down any isagogical information pertinent to your text and not to be forgotten.

## III

Here is the blow that counts! Here is the key to the revival and survival of your long neglected language work. Carefully copy into your book the Hebrew or Greek of your entire text. You may wish to do this on alternate lines and leave room for an interlinear translation later on.

At first, you will be discouraged by the slowness of your clumsy copy ability. You will look many times at each word, letter, accent, vowel point. And at that you will produce a corrupted copy of the text time and again. But you did pray for patience and perseverance, so stay with it.

You prayed for encouragement, so you will soon note little joys, new joys, precious joys. Here you will recall a vocable, there a rule of grammar; here a meaning, there a verb form, a plural, a feminine ending.

As you copy your texts in the original week after week,

month after month, your joy increases. How much more familiar you are with the alphabet, how much faster you copy the text, how familiar the original text is getting to look, how many more words you translate directly as you copy out. You are getting to feel at home with the ancient languages — how unbelievable — if only Prof. \_\_\_\_\_ could see you now! But you have only begun.

#### IV

Now is the time for your lexicons, grammars, and dictionaries. Go to work on each word and phrase. Dig, discover, uncover, expose, analyze, learn! And record your precious findings in your book listing them verse by verse under "Grammatical notes."

#### V

When you are satisfied that you are master of the words of your text, prepare your own literal translation. Don't worry about the flowing quality of your English; you are not called to be a translator. But put down between the lines of the copied text your best English equivalent for what the original language says.

AFTER you have completed your translation, be humble enough to check against the work of other translators: classic, modern, and your personal favorites (KJV, Luther, Smith-Goodspeed, RSV, Beck, et al). Observe carefully how they handle the original; perhaps they made a keener observation of the intended meaning of a given word. If so, be big enough to correct yours or note the better phrase in your book under "Translation notes."

#### VI

The procedure thus far will have taken a day or two out of the week. Now it is time to sit back comfortably in the quiet of your study — perhaps where you can watch the rain trickle down the window, the clouds slip past, or the

blinking patterns of shade caused by the branches and leaves of the tree outside your window. In this atmosphere give yourself over to meditatio, but to a well-disciplined meditation.

Take your time with this. Let the full accumulation of facts and truths gathered together turn over and over in your mind. Be ready to add parallel and cross reference as familiar words echo others. Gradually coax the results of your meditation into orderliness. Sort it out, arrange it, rearrange it, and finally enter the best of it all into your work book under "Notes and thoughts on the text."

## VII

At this point you are in a safe position to review what exegetes and commentators have noted about your text. To refer to them any sooner will frustrate your initiative, your originality, and take you back to the stale sound of a quote rather than the freshness of the living Word in your work. Be careful — some exegetes and commentators say much which the text does not say. (This is always a good time to check yourself. You too could grow wise in your own conceits.)

Learn to sort out the work of others by scan-reading it. Take note of the unusual grammatical point which will have much to do in applying the text, note the apt expression, the word picture. Note the false conclusion to be rejected, the Gospel made social in the name of relevancy. Gather the useful notes into your book under "What others say."

## VIII

Now analyze your entire study of the text and search out with scholarly accuracy the literal meaning and sense of your text — the message for which God caused it to be recorded and called you to teach it. When you have determined and formulated this lesson of the text, you are ready to leave exegesis and move to homiletics whereby

you will share by communication the precious Truth. You are now ready to herald with conviction: THIS IS WHAT THE LORD OUR GOD HAS SAID!

G. Radtke

## TWO CHAPEL ADDRESSES

The Text: Hebrews 2:14-15:

"Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same: that through death he might . . . deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage."

The marvel of our Redemption is a never-told tale. Strange that it should be so when one considers the time we take in telling this story — over and over again in song, in prayer, in preaching. Somehow we never come to the end, where we can say: There, that's the whole story. There is always something more.

Consider the text, which was read in abbreviated form in order to emphasize its message of the interlocking shackles. It speaks of those who "through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage."

We might have understood it quickly if the words read: Who in their lifetime of bondage were subject to the fear of death. For we know that because of our bondage to sin we could not escape the fear of death, the wages of sin. But our text reverses the picture: Through fear of death we were all our lifetime subject to bondage.

Our slavery in sin made us afraid of death; but our fear of death also produced a bondage of another sort. Slaves cannot live their lives to their own advantage. And the fear of death is such a terrible taskmaster that those who suffer under it are sentenced to a life that constantly

makes demands for its own sake. They must live always for just one thing: To preserve life, to stretch it as far as possible so as to be sure to miss none of its enjoyment or to gain time against the despair that always waits just around the corner. They are, you might say and as Paul does say, in bondage to the rudiments of this world: Touch not, taste not, handle not!

For the fear of death is a terrible thing, a Pharaoh that no man can handle. Death is a horrible thing; and no pretty philosophy, no beautiful funerals and no simple sentiment can change that fact. We were not created to die, but to live. Death is a smashing of the masterpiece of God's creative power.

But the fear of it is in men a foolish thing because their fear usually centers upon temporal death. They are already spiritually dead; but that does not bother them. They are afraid to die in their sins but not afraid to live in their sins; yet to live in sin is death already begun.

Our blessing is that we have been raised from that death. Buried with Christ by Baptism, we have risen to newness of life. All this in Him, who hath "spoiled principalities and powers, ... made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it." For in His death He was death's pestilence. So did He also deliver us from the fear of death and set us free. For we know that this mortal must put on immortality, and in our flesh we shall see God.

So death has lost its terrors;  
How can you fear it now?  
Its face, once grim, now leads to Him  
At whose command you bow.

We hardly realize, until we are alerted to it, how abolishing the fear of death has delivered us from a life-long bondage to life itself. Once hemmed in between cradle and grave, we had to run scared. Everything we did or planned was priced according to its cost in terms of

what it would do to this poor, short life expectancy that was ours. But now our horizons are greatly widened. We can pursue the course of godly purpose and not be concerned about how long it will take. Our goal stake has been moved from the cemetery plot into eternity. A desirable life's work is measured, not by how fast we can reach the top or get rich before the grim reaper cuts us down, or by how much atonement we can make for our sins before the Judgment, but by how we can best use our talents to glorify our Redeemer, seek the furtherance of His Gospel, and become a blessing to our fellow-man.

Any other calculations we would make would dishonor the redemption of our lives from death by the death of the Cross. Is it still really necessary that we achieve success as the world measures it? In that hunger there is the smell of the fear of death. We have a better option. May we all learn to walk, with heads uplifted, in the pathways of freedom.

---

The Text: Acts 9:18:

"And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales: and he received sight."

At one time in the ministry of our Lord a certain blind beggar along the road to Jericho cried out in faith, "Lord, that I may receive my sight!" Our Lord replied: "Receive thy sight; thy faith hath saved thee." I know that this incident is far removed from the subject of our text this morning; and yet there is a common thought between Saul and the blind beggar. Both were blind, and both believed, and both were healed by our Lord Jesus Christ. While we know nothing more about the blind beggar of Jericho, we are able to follow the Apostle Paul as he journeyed through the then-known world preaching Christ. And we are so impressed by the things that the Apostle Paul was now able to see, as reflected both in his teachings and his life, that we are ready to beg, "Lord, that I may receive my sight." It is these words that we have chosen as the theme of our meditation this morning.

It is at once clear that we are speaking in a rather abstract way — what we really want is not necessarily sight at all, but insight, this gift of faith whereby we are able to evaluate our personal lives, the gift that gives us goals and purposes and enables us to make the right decisions. It is this gift that the unconverted Saul was totally lacking, and thus his three days of blindness were also in a sense symbolic, symbolic of his previous life in which he had been persecuting Christians and walking about as a pious Pharisee. He thought he saw, he even thought he had insight — after all, he had the best education the first century universities could provide — but that was precisely his problem. He thought he saw; and that is the nature of all sin and unbelief; we think we see. As our Lord said to the Pharisees in St. John chapter 9: "If ye were blind, ye should have no sin: but now ye say we see; therefore your sin remaineth."

The first step to insight, then, is that we realize we are blind without Jesus Christ! I wonder if we appreciate the full implications of this truth. We are really not so much different from Paul the Pharisee in so many ways, for how often doesn't our behavior lack insight; how often don't we go about our daily work without real goals or purpose; how often don't we make wrong decisions, and defend foolish causes, and sometimes get into very serious trouble with our neighbor or our teachers because our behavior lacked insight — because we lost sight of the fact that our parents and superiors are representatives of God, because we lost sight of the fact that we are here to live, not for ourselves but for our neighbor, because we lost sight of the fact that life is not an end in itself and that we are pilgrims and strangers here, destined for the world to come. Without Christ there is no insight; we have insight into neither Law nor Gospel. It was this very Paul, whose eyes were here opened, who wrote the Romans many years later: "For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died;" and again he wrote to the Corinthians, "For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish, foolishness." Without Christ we tend to look at the Law as a way to save our-

selves and the Gospel as mythological nonsense, and life as a time for self-realization at the expense of everyone else and our own everlasting soul. How desperately we need the insight that God's Word provides — how much more the world about us!

What a tremendous moment when Paul could see again — the text tells us that it was as if scales fell off from his eyes and he could see once more. But far more important than his earthly vision was the true insight he had received into life — faith in Jesus Christ had provided a new set of values and a new set of meanings and purposes, so that he could write to the Corinthians, "For we walk by faith, not by sight."

Look how faith had changed his behavior! His first act after receiving his sight was to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ. This was his new Lord and Master and from now on his total effort was to be devoted to Christ's service and honor. As soon as he had eaten and had strength enough he spent a few days with the Christian disciples at Damascus and then went right to the synagogue; but instead of capturing Christians, he boldly declared that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and the Jews stood around with their mouths agape, amazed and unable to believe what they saw. Some even ventured to give Paul an argument, but the more they argued, the more skilfully and vehemently Paul defended the very truth that Christ is the promised Messiah of the Scriptures. The Bible tells us that his opponents were literally confounded! It is not at all unlikely that Paul's bold testimony was a mighty influence to build up and establish the very church at Damascus that he had originally come to destroy.

This changed behavior of St. Paul is almost melodramatic and it certainly is inspiring. How often we wish that we could show the same dedication to Christ's cause, the same willingness to live and preach and defend Christ crucified, the same singleness of heart and purpose. Yet we can reflect the same behavior. The very grace that opened

the eyes of Paul's soul will give us true spiritual insight, too. God in his Word provides insight into our greatest problem, the problem of sin, and assures us of forgiveness and every other blessing.

May we then read our Scriptures, faithfully search them, and repeatedly ask, "Lord, that we may receive our sight," and we will receive sight and insight that will see us through every circumstance of life to the very gates of heaven.

## ===== PANORAMA =====

REPLY TO                      Christianity Today, in its issue of March  
A PROPOSAL                31, carries a moving editorial appeal to  
                                      which reaction should not be denied by  
those who truly have the interests of the historic Gospel of  
salvation at heart.

Under the heading, "Evangelicals and Ecumenical Crisis," the article posits the proposition that "if the world is to be evangelized in our generation, evangelical Christians will have to do it." The possibility that any of the large Protestant church organizations, such as the National Council of Churches or the World Council of Churches, may yet espouse this cause is considered remote. For, as the article says, the establishment of conciliar Christianity "is preoccupied with the goal of a great world church while the theology of the Church is in decay, the evangelistic task of the Church is neglected, and the influence of the Church is misused politically."

With this assessment of the situation we are in full accord, as indeed also with the spirit, if not the literal aim, of the hope expressed that "by obedient love for Christ, by theological confession of the truth of the Bible,

and by evangelical witness to the lost we may yet be able to redress the evangelical failure of conciliar ecumenism in the twentieth century." Without doubt "a deepening commitment" to the task of spreading the knowledge of God's doctrine of salvation is the need of the hour!

It is when the article tells us how this need ought to be met that we find ourselves faced with what appears as a serious flaw in the appeal. The program as visualized finds summary expression in these words: "Let evangelical believers go to prayer, band together in witness for Christ, clasp hands across denominational lines to proclaim the Gospel, and get on with fulfilling the Risen Christ's command to the Church." It is considered a hopeful sign that "in the United States, leaders whose hearts are burdened for evangelism are trampling down old prejudices" and that "signs appear of a unification of scattered evangelical forces for the great purpose of giving visibility to the demand of the Crucified and Risen Christ for personal faith in Him." It is thus that the article hopes for the Gospel's success; for it has stipulated that "pan-evangelical cooperative thrust is needed to coordinate the evangelical outreach on a global basis and to secure the fullest public impact and interest."

We are reminded at this point of the scathing indictment which the article has lodged against the great Councils that dominate the Protestant churches of our day, and specifically against their leaders who are "preoccupied with the goal of a great world church . . ." Nothing is more detrimental to the cause of the Gospel of Christ than this passion for mass ecumenicity and ecclesiastical gigantism. It not only destroys every semblance of theological orthodoxy but by that very violence crushes the spirit out of which true evangelical activity must flow.

But when the article under discussion proposes unification across denominational lines and sees the need of global efforts in Gospel work as so overwhelmingly large that it can be met only by mass effort; when therefore it is

willing to discount significant doctrinal differences that separate the denominations, asking in effect that these be ignored or placed into limbo while we get on with Christ's work: is this not evidence of an equally serious misconception of the true nature of the Church's task? As an alternative to the theologically shapeless conciliar super-church we are offered an "evangelical" cooperative with a theological Joseph's coat of many colors. And this, after all, also in the interest of size, of numerical strength, of mass, "to secure the fullest public impact and interest." Is it thus that Christ's work must be done . . . by abandoning the apostolic injunction that we "be of one mind, and all speak the same thing"?

Surely the leaders of the National and World Councils are not the only ones who "speak perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." There are others who "cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine" which we have learned. We feel bound to declare that Holy Scripture does not permit us to make common cause with any who, while professing loyalty to the cardinal doctrines of the Gospel and the integrity of the inerrant, inspired Word, distort the truth of justification and evince no Scriptural understanding of the nature and efficacy of the Means of Grace, to say nothing of the proper distinction between Law and Gospel.

It grieves us that we cannot find in the proposal of conservative Calvinism at least the seed of a legitimate plan for action. But we do not therefore despair of the cause of the Gospel in the world. Its clear-throated voice is being heard only in the testimony of minority groups today; yet it was never otherwise, and never will be. Even the great genius of the Lutheran Reformation was never widely recognized, and the Lutherans of the Formula of Concord were and remained but a small fraction of outward Christendom. Nevertheless we hold that, when the Savior says: "And this Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come" (Matt. 24:14), He does not

issue a categorical imperative which calls for an activity in violation of the restrictions which the Word places upon joint work, but comforts us with the assurance that He will see to it in His way that the message entrusted to His "little flock" is heard everywhere before He comes to Judgment.

What the Lord to that end may choose to accomplish through Christian witness within the essentially schismatic forces of fundamentalist church bodies we may safely leave to His wisdom. We pray Him to prosper the Scriptural preaching of Christ Crucified whenever and wherever it resounds in the world. But this we know, that hands clasped "across denominational lines to preach the Gospel" supply, not a union in which there is strength, but a Gospel whose truths have been compromised at the outset, foreshadowing a decay which because of its subtle deceit poses a greater threat to the souls of men than the overt perversions of the conciliar movement.

We continue to see our situation as the framers of the Formula of Concord saw theirs when they wrote:

"Now, although the Christian doctrine of this Confession has in great part remained unchallenged (save what has been done by the Papists), yet it cannot be denied that some theologians have departed from some great and important articles of the said Confession, and either have not attained to their true meaning, or at any rate have not continued steadfastly therein, and occasionally have even undertaken to attach to it a foreign meaning, while at the same time they wished to be regarded as adherents of the Augsburg Confession, and to avail themselves and make their boast of it. From this, grievous and injurious dissensions have arisen in the pure evangelical churches; just as even during the lives of the holy apostles among those who wished to be called Christians, and boasted of Christ's doctrine, horrible errors arose likewise. ...

"Against these the holy apostles had to inveigh strenu-

ously in their sermons and writings, although they were well aware that also at that time such fundamental errors and severe controversies could not occur without offense both to unbelievers and to those weak in the faith. ...

"For the controversies which have occurred are not, as some would regard them, mere misunderstandings or disputes concerning words (as are apt to occur), one side not having sufficiently grasped the meaning of the other, and the difficulty lying thus in a few words which are not of great moment; but here the subjects of controversy are important and great, and of such nature that the opinion of the party in error cannot be tolerated in the Church of God, much less be excused or defended.

"Necessity, therefore, requires us to explain these controverted articles according to God's Word and approved writings, so that every one who has Christian understanding can notice which opinion concerning the matters in controversy accords with God's Word and the Christian Augsburg Confession, and which does not. And sincere Christians who have the truth at heart may guard and protect themselves against the errors and corruptions that have arisen." (Trig. 847:6ff.)

E. Schaller

THE LORD  
LAUGHS

While one kind of spacemen are wrestling with the problem of getting a man to the moon, another is occupied intensely with a far greater one. These are the astronomers, men who sit in dark observatories, searching the skies with their gigantic telescopes and refractors, poring over the photographs with which they chart the skies and record their observations. First they worked with primitive instruments, and saw much, even then. Then, as their 'scopes and other equipment were perfected, they saw more and more, yet never the end. Such a mass of data had accumulated that it seemed hopelessly beyond the grasp of human mind, until a famous physicist, Albert Einstein, drew up

a mathematical equation which seemed to bring order out of chaos, even though it operated with the revolutionary concept of the effect of gravitation on light. That was hardly a generation ago.

Now comes a group of California scientists, working with the largest and most powerful astronomical equipment ever devised. They report on their observations of a star, specifically a "quasar" (quasi-stellar source of radiation, and in this case also light). While this object is receding at a rate of speed infinitely beyond anything ever observed before, yet it shines with a light which (to their instruments) makes it seem startlingly near. All this has thrown what has so far been known about this type of heavenly bodies into such confusion that one of these scientists has said, with admirable candor: "If you get an impression of uncertainty about the state of knowledge of quasars, you are right. That is what the situation is." (TIME Magazine, April 7, 1967)

In the meantime the Lord, sitting in the heavens, must be laughing as He makes His observations concerning the feeble efforts of men trying to measure His handiwork. In fact, He is laughing. In the Second Psalm He tells us so.

E. Reim

LUTHER-WORDS  
TO PREACHERS  
OF THE WORD

"When you are praised, then know that it is not you, but God who is being praised, to whom alone all praise and honor is due. For that you teach

rightly and lead a godly life is not of your doing, but is a gift of God. Therefore it is not you, but God in you who is extolled, whose grace in Christ you are proclaiming. As long as you recognize this, you will walk a proper course, conduct yourself in an orderly manner and not be adversely affected by praise (1 Cor. 4:7). Nor will you, on the other hand, be so shaken by ignominy, abuse or persecution that because of them you should desire to abandon your call and

your office."

\* \* \* \* \*

"We preach nothing new, but ever and without ceasing of that Man who is called Jesus Christ, true God and man, delivered for our offenses and raised again for our justification. But though we incessantly preach and urge just this, we shall never be able to grasp it in a manner that is fully adequate, but must continue to be as infants, as children, who are just learning to speak and are barely able to utter complete words."

\* \* \* \* \*

"The doctrine is not ours, but God's, who has simply called us to be slaves and servants; therefore we should not and cannot surrender even the most insignificant letter or phrase of it. Moreover, the doctrine is so precisely defined and demarcated that one cannot add to or detract therefrom without causing significant damage. Therefore the doctrine must remain absolutely clean and pure, clear and perspicuous, like a golden ring without gap or rupture. For when such a ring has been broken, it is no longer whole."

\* \* \* \* \*

"Preachers are to rule well their own houses (1 Tim. 5:8) and have chaste, quiet wives as well as pious children, lest they offend Christians more by their domestic life than they improve them with their preaching. How can they preside well in the Church if they do not rule well their own households? (1 Tim. 3:5). He who is serious about serving the Church faithfully and rebuking sin certainly cannot allow his house, wife or child to live reprehensibly and wantonly. And he who suffers his household to lead coarse and frivolous lives will certainly not be of much service to those of the Church or to those outside."



# C O N T E N T S

VOLUME 7

JULY, 1967

NUMBER 3

## ESSAYS AND ARTICLES

LUTHER AND THE FORTY-SIXTH PSALM . . . . .	1
E. Reim	
HOW GOD PREPARED THE WORLD FOR THE REFORMATION (Conclusion) . . . . .	8
C. M. Gullerud	
THE PENTATEUCH AND ITS CRITICS (Conclusion) . .	13
E. Schaller	

## PREACHING THE WORD

DO-IT-YOURSELF EXEGESIS FOR THE PARSONAGE STUDY . . . . .	20
G. Radtke	
TWO CHAPEL ADDRESSES . . . . .	25

## PANORAMA

REPLY TO A PROPOSAL . . . . .	30
E. Schaller	
THE LORD LAUGHS . . . . .	34
E. Reim	
LUTHER-WORDS TO PREACHERS OF THE WORD . .	35