



"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**

---

---

" G O S P E L   R E D U C T I O N I S M "

It has become increasingly evident in our times that the Sola Scriptura principle has become a primary touchstone of orthodoxy. Based on this Reformation principle ("the Scriptures alone"), the early confessors of the Lutheran faith voiced convictions that should be held by every theologian and every Christian who studies the Bible: God's truth comes to us by Scripture alone; the Scriptures were verbally inspired and are therefore reliable, truthful and inerrant in all their words and parts, also where they treat of historical, geographical, scientific or other matters.<sup>1</sup> These convictions are being attacked in our day by many modern theologians. In some of their attacks not only do they deny that the convictions were held by the Reformers, chiefly Martin Luther, but they also contend that even if these principles were held by the Reformers, they were more honored in the breach than in their being scrupulously observed and followed.

In times past, when such criticism of the principles of Luther and his contemporaries was published, we might have had the tendency to dismiss it, as being the efforts of enemies of the Lutheran Reformation, from Roman Catholic and Reformed circles. After all, one might expect such efforts at discrediting the Reformation principles to come from them. However, more and more such attacks have been coming from Lutheran theologians, especially in the last few years. Previous articles in our JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY have dealt at some length with the defense of the doctrine of verbal inspiration, as well as efforts to define and isolate the doctrinal errors upon which current historical-critical methods of biblical interpretation are based. Now, it appears that we must make an effort to come to grips with what seems to be the most recent (or, rather, the most recently re-appearing) attack on the principle of Sola Scriptura. We make the effort because the attack is coming from within Lutheran circles in our own country, and has been occasioned by the controversy which has existed between the administration of the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod and the former members of the faculty of Concordia Seminary in St. Louis, that church body's principle the-

ological seminary. One segment of the Status Controversiae can perhaps best be presented by quoting from Affirm, a periodical published by so-called conservatives within the LCMS: "One of the most important doctrinal issues facing our church today is the relationship between Gospel and Scripture. In question form the issues might be stated this way, 'Is the Bible God's inspired and authoritative Word on all matters concerning which it speaks or can we permit ourselves freedom on those matters that are not explicitly part of the Gospel?' The latter view is sometimes described as 'Gospel reductionism.' What is binding doctrine is narrowed or reduced to that which touches the Gospel. To give a few examples, Gospel reductionism approaches the Virgin Birth, the miracles of Jesus, the doctrine of original sin or the question of the ordination of women not by asking, 'Does the Bible teach clearly on this matter?' but 'What does my position on these matters do to the Gospel?'"<sup>2</sup>

Much of this present writing will be an attempt to respond to an article by Scott H. Hendrix in the February, 1974, Lutheran Quarterly. The article bears the innocuous-sounding title, "Luther and the Climate for Theological Education," but it is actually an attempt, as the author himself declares, "... to comfort the weak-hearted and the distressed by demonstrating that it has happened before."<sup>3</sup> In the author's view those who need comfort are the self-dispossessed former members of the faculty of Concordia Seminary. The comfort he seeks to bring them is partly based on the historical fact that at least since the Middle Ages there have been repeated instances of a conflict between church authority and academic freedom. To be more specific, before the Reformation the opposing parties in the dispute were church officials, with the pope at the top, on the one side, and the teachers of theology at the newly established universities on the other side. Without question, the theologians lost whenever the debate came to an actual head and were obliged to recant whenever the bishops were able to demonstrate that they (the theologians) were contradicting the pronouncements of the pope. Although Hendrix does not specifically and in so many words state that President J.A.O. Preus of the LCMS has been using "papal authority" in his successful attempt to suspend John Tietjen from the presidency of Concordia Seminary, yet

his implications are obvious.

It is, however, in the next section that Hendrix launches the essence of his attack against conservative Lutheranism. For here his argument is that after the Reformation, when Luther established his own "climate of theological education," he instituted an academic freedom under which theologians were able to work and teach -- where Luther's "campaign for free access to the Word of God" had this effect that "it does prohibit the use of any human interpretation of the Word of God as a restriction on the pursuit of truth to be found in that Word."<sup>4</sup> A certain "ambiguity" weighs upon every theological teacher -- a result of the desire to have freedom to investigate and do research while at the same time remaining true to the particular teachings of his church. In making this observation, Hendrix also expresses himself well on the nature of the a priori commitment which the theologian cannot help making before he begins his work. "Furthermore, all scholarship involves some prior commitment regarding the nature of truth and the method of discovering it. Pure scholarly objectivity and the unprejudiced search for truth are academic fictions. No scholar goes hunting for the truth in his field without having some idea beforehand what that truth is or, at least, a preference for one interpretation over another. There is no scholarship without that kind of commitment. That is just as true for the historian as it is for the theologian."<sup>5</sup> That commitment can become, for Hendrix and others of his persuasion, rather than a safeguard preventing the student from wandering astray from the truth, a sort of "monkey on your back," hanging over the theologian's shoulder, keeping him from "true objectivity."

It is here, of course, that we must take issue. We agree that the true theologian has his prior commitment, but that commitment itself must be to more than the pronouncements of a church leader, or the decrees of a council, or the dicta resolved by some board, or even to his own professional attitude. One must have the firm conviction that his commitment is to the Will of God; to God's revealed truth and to His divine authority. It is not enough to make a prior commitment "regarding the nature of truth and the method of discovering it," unless one understands by that that truth is the will of God, and that one discovers it through the hearing and reading

of God's inspired Word, the sacred Scriptures. Unhesitatingly, we must affirm and reaffirm that restriction on our freedom to investigate and teach theology -- for God Himself requires it. We are to tremble before His Word and to proclaim it as the Oracles of God. We have had occasion to make this point before.<sup>6</sup>

Hendrix suggests that the tension existing between the theologian's academic freedom and his commitment to the doctrines of his church is a desirable condition which he terms "the ambiguous relationship between so-called objectivity and commitment, the old ambiguity between knowing and believing, reason and faith." He claims that Martin Luther fostered this "tension-management" condition in such a way that "... seminary professors can be committed to the Lutheran confessions without submitting their teaching and research to a line by line comparison with the confessions or approval by the prelates of the Church. They can do this because Luther himself freed even theological professors -- together with other Christians -- from the necessity to sacrifice their intellect to any human formulation of the truth."

In attempting to relate recent theological history to Reformation history, Hendrix is equating the doctrinal pronouncements of the papacy with the doctrinal pronouncements made by the administration of a modern church body -- without entering into the question of whether or not those pronouncements are in accord with the will of God as revealed in His Word. And that makes all the difference, of course. We, too, rejoice in the historic statements of Luther that the conscience is not bound to tradition or to decisions of councils or to decrees of man. We thank God often for Luther's struggle for free access to the Word of God for every Christian. But when this conviction of the great reformer is used as a basis for an academic freedom which allows a theological professor to proclaim whatever his own personal conscience dictates to him, then that is far distant from Luther's intent.

For Luther, God's Word was the Scripture -- he declared it often. He believed in and taught verbal inspiration of the Scriptures.<sup>7</sup> One need only read his commentary on the creation account in Genesis 1 and 2 to observe how ready Luther was to put his reason into subjection and to bow before the inspired Word. And what

Luther believed about the inviolability of certain passages he believed regarding all of Scripture. It is true that he believed, as does any Christian, that the kernel and chief purpose of all Scripture is that it teaches Christ, that is, the way to salvation through Christ. After all, Scripture itself testifies to that. But to cite Luther as exemplar of a modern principle teaching that whatever in Scripture does not directly (practically ipsis verbis) proclaim the kerygma can be relegated to a position where it might be permissible to reject it as binding truth is intellectual dishonesty. It reveals a failure to let Luther himself speak except in certain isolated, carefully selected, partial quotations.

As example, former Concordia Seminary President John Tietjen is quoted as "reminding his accusers" of a statement of Luther that "... it is ultimately true that the gospel itself is our guide and instructor in the Scriptures ... Christ himself did not write anything but only spoke. He called his teaching not Scripture but gospel, meaning good news or a proclamation that is spread not by pen but by word of mouth."<sup>8</sup> And another modern theologian expresses the theological stance supposedly held by Luther (at least, in sympathy) in the following way. First, he complains that the fact that there are many doctrines taught in the church proves that too many theologians "have forgotten the gospel and forged systems of doctrine which prevent men from hearing the gospel." Thus, he argues, "we are ... offered a great many propositions, ranging from a specific doctrine of creation to the condition of man's soul after death which we are asked to believe, as if we were saved by doctrine instead of by grace ..." The same theologian expresses his case in this way, "One must ask oneself, for example, what would happen to a 'doctrine' of the place of women in the church, or a literalistic doctrine of creation, or some particular doctrines of the inspiration of scripture, or explicit explanations of the mystery of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, or a doctrine of church order, or of church government, or a host of others, if we would put them to the test of the question, 'What has this to do with the gospel?' Would we not quickly see that they have no essential connection with the gospel and therefore find ourselves able to live with many divergent formulations of doctrine in our common understanding of, and commitment to. the centrality of the gospel?"<sup>9</sup>

Almost as on a broken record, one finds modern Lutheran theologians claiming that those who declare "gospel reductionism" to be wrong will have to include Luther in their condemnation. But the fact is that Luther did not permit his acceptance of the Gospel as the heart of the Bible to allow him to relegate other doctrines of Scripture (or even passages the meaning of which he readily acknowledged his failure to understand) to a position where they could be accepted or rejected as one sees fit. On the contrary, Luther clearly stated that a denial or rejection of a single article of Scripture involves one in a denial of all. "For it is certain that whoever does not rightly believe in one article of faith, or does not want to believe (after he has been admonished), he surely believes no article with an earnest and true faith. And whoever is so bold that he dares to deny God or to accuse him of lying in one word, and he does this maliciously in opposition to that about which he was once or twice admonished and instructed, he also dares (and he certainly does it, too) to deny God in all of his words and to accuse him of lying. For this reason we say that everything is to be believed completely and without exception, or nothing is to be believed. The Holy Spirit does not let himself be divided or cut up so that he should let one point be taught and believed as trustworthy and another as false."<sup>10</sup> Luther's sermon on John 16:3 has been adduced by the "gospel reductionists" as evidence that he held their view. In the sermon Luther does hold out the doctrine of the Gospel as the chief doctrine of Scripture, and he does declare: "Throughout history we find that all heresy and error has arisen where this doctrine has disappeared, where people become smug, as though they knew it very well, and thus turned from it to something else and began to dispute about the Person of Christ, whether He was true God or a mere man." But in the same paragraph Luther makes a very firm point (and this sentence the modern theologians seem to have not noticed!): "... all other doctrines stand and fall with this one; it includes all the others; it is all-important. He who errs in the others certainly errs in this one too. Even if he holds to the others, still all is in vain if he does not have this one."<sup>11</sup>

Tietjen and his followers in the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod would do well to pay closer heed to the words of their seemingly almost forgotten mentor, Francis

Pieper, when he declared: "The Christian doctrine as taken from Scripture, without any foreign admixture, is not a conglomeration of disconnected truths, but an unbroken harmonious unity in which justification by faith, without the deeds of the Law, stands in the center and all other doctrines are either antecedent or consequent to it. It follows that a correct understanding of the doctrine of justification prepares the way for correctly understanding all the Christian doctrines, and, per contra, that when this doctrine is no longer correctly presented, one can no longer differentiate between Christianity and heathenism."<sup>12</sup> I believe that it should be clearly evident that Pieper is in agreement with Luther in this matter, and that the modern Lutheran theologian who accepts the principle of "gospel reductionism" cannot rightfully claim Luther as being in the same camp with him.

Hendrix, in his Lutheran Quarterly article, seeks to show Luther as a theological leader who was somewhat permissive. No demands were made upon his colleagues at Wittenberg, the article would seem to indicate, to conform to more than a simple pledge "to defend evangelical truth with all my might." However, as related by Bente in his historical introduction to the Concordia Triglotta, pledges to the Lutheran Symbols, which were taken by many, had been introduced at the University of Wittenberg as early as 1533, and were demanded from candidates for the degree of Doctor of Divinity. When, later, Melancthon was severely criticized by Osiander for the "oath of confession" in vogue at Wittenberg, he "... emphasized the fact that the doctrinal pledges demanded at Wittenberg had been introduced, chiefly by Luther, for the purpose of 'maintaining the true doctrine.' 'For,' said Melancthon, 'many enthusiasts were roaming about at that time, each, in turn, spreading new silly nonsense, e.g., the Anabaptists, Servetus, Campanus, Schwenckfeld, and others. And such tormenting spirits are not lacking at any time (Et non desunt tales furiae ullo tempore).' A doctrinal pledge, Melancthon furthermore explained, was necessary 'in order correctly to acknowledge God and call upon Him to preserve harmony in the Church, and to bridle the audacity of such as invent new doctrines.'"<sup>13</sup>

Bente further recounts an incident occurring at Wittenberg not long before Luther's death, which indicates very clearly that not only did the Reformer expect that



graduates of his university were to conform to the confessions of the church, but also that the professors themselves were to be examined as to their conformity. Bente's account is as follows: "It was, above all, the spirit of indifferentism toward false doctrine, particularly concerning the Lord's Supper, which Luther observed and deplored in his Wittenberg colleagues: Melanchthon, Bugenhagen, Cruciger, Eber, and Major. Shortly before his last journey to Eisleben he invited them to his house, where he addressed to them the following solemn words of warning: They should 'remain steadfast in the Gospel; for I see that soon after my death the most prominent brethren will fall away. I am not afraid of the Papists,' he added; 'for most of them are coarse, unlearned asses and Epicureans; but our brethren will inflict the damage on the Gospel, for "they went out from among us, but they were not of us" (I John 2, 19); they will give the Gospel a harder blow than did the Papists.' About the same time Luther had written above the entrance to his study: 'Our professors are to be examined on the Lord's Supper.' When Major, who was about to leave for the colloquy at Regensburg, entered and inquired what these words signified, Luther answered: 'The meaning of these words is precisely what you read and what they say; and when you and I shall have returned, an examination will have to be held, to which you as well as others will be cited.'" And when Major protested that he did not hold to any false doctrine (in a manner evidently similar to the protestations of Tietjen and his followers that their doctrine is pure!), Luther replied with the well-known and oft-quoted words: "It is by your silence and cloaking that you cast suspicion upon yourself. If you believe as you declare in my presence, then speak so also in the church, in public lectures, in sermons, and in private conversations, and strengthen your brethren, and lead the erring back to the right path, and contradict the contumacious spirits; otherwise your confession is sham pure and simple, and worth nothing. Whoever really regards his doctrine, faith, and confession as true, right, and certain cannot remain in the same stall with such as teach, or adhere to, false doctrine; nor can he keep on giving friendly words to Satan and his minions. A teacher who remains silent when errors are taught, and nevertheless pretends to be a true teacher, is worse than an open fanatic and by his hypocrisy does greater damage

than a heretic. ..."<sup>14</sup>

When modern Lutheran theologians attempt to take us back to Luther's Wittenberg to see there a climate for theological education which would be conducive toward a historical-critical approach to Biblical hermeneutics, and toward a theology which would permit a professor to teach whatever his personal conscience or his academic freedom would lead him to regarding all doctrines of the church, if only he is willing to proclaim the kerygma of Christ (Whatever that may be when you "de-mythologize," i.e. take out the miraculous from the history of Christ's life!) -- when they try to use Luther as their guru in their "gospel reductionism" -- they are simply barking up the wrong tree! If they want academic freedom (euphemism for "freedom from the authority of the verbally inspired Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions"), then let them search for their roots in the modern universities and divinity schools where they were taught, not in Wittenberg.

Modern Lutheran theology is going in the same direction as modern theology in every camp -- Roman Catholic and Reformed as well. That direction, with its absence of a reliance on a verbally inspired revealed Truth of God, leads to the kind of theology that Hendrix extols and lauds and wishes for every theologian: "The search for truth in the various theological disciplines is never ended and that truth never certain. Because no one has to pretend that it is, everyone can enjoy the freedom to hunt for it." This, for the modern theologian, "demonstrates how one can be true to one's Christian commitment and at the same time keep the confessional and hierarchical monkeys off one's back." For them, with their evident lack of a complete research into Luther's life and career, the Reformer led the way into a climate where "Teachers and students can go about the task of sound, scholarly work, open to all possibilities of interpretation and criticism, because they know that they are by nature fallible and that truth resides in God's promise alone."<sup>15</sup>

Thus the modern theologian reveals his ignorance of the true nature of Christian theology, as well as his own arrogance and lack of willingness to tremble before God's Word. He has cast off the authority of Christ's own witness of the authority of Scripture and yet claims to be searching for Christ in some "gospel" evidently apart and

distinct from the Gospel revealed in Scripture (Else why so vehement in his objection to having his theology tied to Scripture?).

May God in His grace and mercy preserve us from such a "freedom" from His Word!

J. Lau

FOOTNOTES

1. Journal of Theology, September, 1972, p. 2.
  2. Affirm, March 15, 1974, p. 4. Underlinings are in the original.
  3. Lutheran Quarterly, February, 1974, p. 4.
  4. Ibid., p. 7.
  5. Ibid., p. 5.
  6. Journal of Theology, op. cit., p. 3f.
  7. Cf. Francis Pieper, Christian Dogmatics, "Luther and the Inspiration of Holy Scripture," Volume I, pp. 276-298. Also, Journal of Theology, June, 1973, pp. 8-15.
  8. Quoted in Robert Jewett, "The Gospel as Heresy: Concordia Seminary in Exile," The Christian Century, March 27, 1974, pp. 336-340.
  9. Martin L. Kretzmann, "What on Earth Does the Gospel Change?", Lutheran World (Lutheran World Federation publication), XVI, 4, as quoted in Affirm, March 15, 1974, p. 7.
  10. Luther's Works (American Edition), Vol. 38, p. 308.
  11. Luther's Works (American Edition), Vol. 24, p. 320. Underlining added for emphasis.
  12. F. Pieper, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 514.
  13. F. Bente, "Introduction to the Lutheran Confessions," Concordia Triglotta, Part 7.
  14. Ibid., p. 94.
  15. Lutheran Quarterly, op. cit., p. 11.
-

---

THE LOVE IN ROMANS 16:17-18

"Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them.

"For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple."

This passage of Scripture is used much by us in our congregational and private lives as Christians. It tells us clearly that it is our gracious God's will that we avoid those who come along with teachings or practices which do not agree with the apostolic Word, and who cause divisions in the church and set traps which can destroy faith. The word "avoid" is clear, and it is broad. It surely forbids any and all religious fellowship, whether public or private, with those who are promoting or supporting false doctrine!

But, in all honesty, haven't we at times felt uncomfortable about that Scriptural principle of separation which is taught in this and other passages of Scripture? Religious separation is very unpopular in our day, since it is just the opposite of the religious unionism (outward union without unity in confession) which is being pushed by most churches in our day. Obeying God in this matter can lead us into some very awkward and trying situations, and our flesh shies away from such difficulties. How hard it was during the recent war for some of our boys to refuse to attend the religious services on base together with their buddies -- and then to have to defend their separation before their commanding officer! How difficult it can be to tell friends or relatives whom we are visiting that we cannot join them in their worship or prayer because we do not share the same Scriptural confession! How uncomfortable it can be to say "No" when we are asked to support a United Fund drive in our community -- to say "No" because some of the money we give would be used to support such religious or semi-religious groups as the Salvation Army or Boy Scouts! Our common

sense asks us, How can that be love to refuse to join with other Christians in their worship or prayers or church work? Doesn't love demand rather that we take part in such religious activities with them, lest we hurt their feelings or disturb their consciences?

It will always be difficult for us to apply the separation principle, especially in our everyday lives, simply because of that flesh that we all carry around with us. But there is something in this passage, Romans 16:17-18, which can help our spirits to follow God's will in this matter -- it's the love that we find in this passage. We can, in fact, speak about three areas of love that Scripture connects with the admonition to avoid:

### God's Love to Us

First, there is God's love to us. God wouldn't have to give us a reason for asking us to avoid those who support religious error. He could simply tell us to avoid, for He is God! But God, in His wisdom, chose to give us a reason. In verse 18, He points out that false teachers are dangerous -- through the "good words and fair speeches" with which they have clothed their errors, they are able to deceive Christians in their simple, child-like faith! God is therefore speaking to us in His love when He asks us to avoid. He wants to keep our souls safe from the deadly leaven and gangrene of religious error. When we hear the word "avoid," we should recognize the voice of the Good Shepherd, as He carries out for us His promise: "I give unto them (my sheep) eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." (John 10:28)

### Our Love to God

But there is also our love toward God. This love is, of course, but a faint reflection of His love to us, for He so loved us that He gave His dearest Treasure, Jesus Christ, into death for our salvation. But if we have received this love of God for us in faith, we will also love Him in return. For Scripture says: "We love Him, because He first loved us." (1 John 4:19) And how will this love express itself? The Bible tells us: "This is the love of (toward) God, that we keep His com-

mandments: and His commandments are not grievous." (1 John 5:3) So surely as the Gospel has created faith and love in our hearts, we will want to heed the will of our heavenly Father, even when He in His love asks us to do something that is difficult for our flesh -- like avoiding. How can this commandment to separate ourselves from religious errorists really be "grievous," when God's purposes to us are so full of His own love?

We must never forget that we are to fear, love, and trust in God above all things. It was surely not easy for Abraham to go and sacrifice his son, his only son, his beloved son, the son in whom the promises of the Savior were centered. It was indeed hard for him to do this, but we are told that he got up early the very next morning and proceeded to carry out God's will. The love of Abraham toward God was deeper even than his love toward his own flesh and blood. And this was right and proper, for as the Lord tells us: "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me." (Matt. 10:37) Will not our love to God prompt us also to be quick and ready to heed His will, even when He asks us to "avoid" religious fellowship with those who may be near and dear to us?

Luther, in his commentary on Ephesians 6:12, puts the matter of obedience to God's Word very pointedly. Notice that he is speaking about this very matter of separation from those who uphold error:

"This [attainment of eternal life] is so great a good that no human heart is able to grasp it. (Therefore it involves also a great and hard fight, and yet it happens so very easily that a person loses it forever by not holding on to the precious Word with all his strength.) And indeed it must not be treated so lightly as the world does, and as some foolish people assert, who are deceived by the devil in the matter of the Sacrament, or another error, and who say that we should not fight so hard about a single article of faith, and so forth, and for its sake destroy Christian love, even to the point of consigning each other to the devil. But rather, so they say, although we err on one small point, since we agree on everything else, we should yield a little and give in, and thus preserve Christian unity or fellowship. No, my dear man, do not talk to me about peace and unity if there-

by God's Word is lost, for then eternal life and everything else would be lost. In this matter there can be no yielding nor any giving in, no, not for love of you or any other person; but everything must yield to the Word, whether it be friend or foe. For the Word was not given for the sake of outward or worldly peace and unity, but rather for the sake of eternal life. The Word and doctrine shall create Christian unity or fellowship. Where there is agreement in doctrine, the rest will surely follow. Where there is no such agreement, no unity remains. Therefore do not talk to me about love and friendship if that means breaking with the Word or faith. For it is not love but the Word that brings eternal life, God's grace, and all heavenly treasures." (St. Louis Walch, IX: 831)

Thus obedience to God's Word, including the principle of separation, must ever be part of our life and walk as Christians. Such obedience dare never be set aside by appeals to what some wrongly call "love" to others!

### Our Love to Our Neighbor

Finally, there is our love toward our neighbor. This too is a fruit of Christian faith, one which we will surely want to exercise. But are we indeed showing love to others when we tell them that we cannot join them in religious fellowship because of the errors which separate us? Indeed this is love, for those errors are, according to God's own Word, dangerous to their salvation. Scripture admonishes us to "speak the truth in love." (Eph. 4: 15) We owe such people the truth, because we owe them love!

An example would be in place here. Do you remember how Peter on one occasion urged Christ not to go to Jerusalem to suffer and die? Peter's intentions were, humanly speaking, very noble -- he wished to spare Christ from such a horrible ordeal. And yet Peter's suggestion brought forth from Christ the stinging rebuke: "Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." (Matt. 16:23) It was Christ's love to Peter that called forth these words. Peter was entrapped in a religious error, and Christ wanted nothing more than to free him from his wrong and dangerous beliefs.

---

Here is another example from everyday life. A doctor discovers that his patient has a cancer which can be cured if an operation is promptly performed. Does he show love to that patient if he hides the fact and pretends that everything is satisfactory? Hardly! Neither would we be showing love to those whose souls are being exposed to false doctrine if we should join them in religious fellowship and thereby cover over or make light of the danger that is confronting their souls. Again, we owe them the truth, because we owe them love.

When a Christian, in a loving way, suggests to a friend or relative that he cannot join him in prayer or worship because the two of them do not share the same Scriptural confession, nothing but good can result. That neighbor may, because of his flesh, at first resent such words, but he will surely remember them and ponder them. And if he is in time led to investigate the teachings of his erring church body in the light of Scripture, the Holy Spirit may thereby lead him away from its errors into a church body that is completely faithful to the Word. This blessed result has happened on more than one occasion! Let it be recognized, then, that when we refuse to participate in prayer or worship or church work with those who deviate from God's Word, this is indeed an act of love to them. For by such God-directed avoiding on our part, they may be moved to see the seriousness of the errors with which they are associated!

### In Summary

So we see, then, that there is really a lot of love which Scripture connects with the "avoid" of Romans 16: 17-18. There is God's protecting love to us. There is our obedient love to God. And there is our concerned love to those who are involved in religious error. May all this love prompt us to a willing obedience to this important commandment of our gracious and wise God!

C. Kuehne

---



THE GREEK ARTICLE  
AND THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST'S DEITY

(Part IV)

One of the earliest scholarly reactions to Sharp's Rule and his exegetical conclusions was Christopher Wordsworth's *Six Letters to Granville Sharp*, published in 1802. As indicated in the last issue of this *Journal*, Wordsworth vindicates Sharp at almost every point, through a large number of quotations from the church fathers and from later Greek and Latin writers. He shows that the principle of grammar described by Sharp was regularly observed, not only in the New Testament, but also in the writings of the Greek fathers. He traces the alleged ambiguity of the passages in question to the influence of the Latin language, which because of its absence of an article is incapable of reproducing the Greek idiom. The Greek text of these passages, he insists, is in no way ambiguous, and it disturbs him that so many commentators between the time of the Reformation and his own day have wrongfully charged these Biblical texts with such unclarity.

The Negative Reaction of Calvin Winstanley

It was inevitable that Sharp's attack upon certain translations in the authorized *King James Version* would in time be countered. Such a negative reaction appeared in 1805, under the title *A Vindication of Certain Passages in the Common English Version of the New Testament*.<sup>1</sup> This treatise, also addressed to Granville Sharp, was written by an English divine, Calvin Winstanley, A.M., of whose life this writer could find no further details. Winstanley's *Vindication* contains what is probably the lengthiest and most scholarly attempt to refute Sharp's conclusions that has yet appeared.

It is indeed apparent that Winstanley expended a large amount of time in researching his treatise, and his attempted refutation of Sharp's Rule and exegetical conclusions seems at first reading to be rather convincing. But a more thorough study of his evidence and arguments soon reveals that they contain some serious flaws.

Winstanley comments as follows regarding the rules of Sharp: "These rules are all founded on the presence or the absence, of the copulative or the article; and nothing can be more imperfect than such rules." (p. 6) He apparently feels that the usage of the definite article by the writers of the New Testament is so random and unpredictable, that it makes the formation of precise rules impossible. He would thus regard the passages cited by Sharp in defense of Christ's deity as ambiguous with respect to their grammatical structure. The true interpretation of them, he feels, must therefore be based upon non-grammatical evidence, drawn from other passages of Scripture.

Winstanley attempts -- unsuccessfully, I believe -- to disparage the validity of Sharp's Rule. He finds himself compelled to admit that this rule is "generally true," but he charges it with being "defective, inasmuch as it is liable to exceptions." (p. 16) He is incapable of finding any clear exceptions in the entire body of New Testament writings, and therefore resorts to non-Biblical literature. He finds a number of "exceptions" in the *Ethics* of Aristotle, such as the following passage: *περὶ ὧν (ἀπολαύσεις) λέγομεν τὸν ἀάφρονα καὶ ἀνόλαστον* [concerning which (enjoyments) we speak of the disciplined and undisciplined man]. Such examples, however, surely do not overthrow the general validity of Sharp's Rule. At most they would suggest this modification, that in Attic Greek the article was not always repeated before the second noun when the two nouns were contradictory in meaning and therefore could not be applied to the same person at the same time. Winstanley even offers such a modification when he states that Sharp's Rule does not hold uniformly "when the signification of the nouns renders any farther mark of personal distinction unnecessary." (p. 17) He then admits, significantly, that in all the passages cited from Aristotle "the nouns, though personal, are used in a general or universal sense. In this respect, it must be confessed, they differ materially from those of which you [Sharp] would correct the common version." (p. 18)

Winstanley proceeds, then, to subjoin several quotations which, he feels, come within the limitations of Sharp's Rule and yet are direct exceptions to it. (pp. 18-21) The first is a passage from Plato's sixth

epistle, which was subsequently cited by Clement of Alexandria and Origen.<sup>2</sup> This passage, however, is so obscure, and so inaccurately quoted by Clement, that appeal cannot rightly be made to it.

The second "exception" offered by Winstanley is from Origen's *Against Celsus*: τῷ θεῷ τῶν ὅλων προσέχετε καὶ διδασκάλῳ τῶν περὶ αὐτοῦ μαθημάτων τῷ Ἰησοῦ (Give heed to the God of all things, and to Jesus, the teacher of all lessons concerning Him).<sup>3</sup> The leading terms of the clause, the two of them connected by καί, are very probably τῷ θεῷ and τῷ Ἰησοῦ, with διδασκάλῳ serving as an adjunct of τῷ Ἰησοῦ. Since *both* of the leading terms have an article, this passage ought not be adduced as an exception to Sharp's Rule, which requires that the article come only before the first noun, as follows: article + personal noun + καί + personal noun.

The same criticism can be brought against Winstanley's third alleged exception: τῷ δὲ θεῷ πατρὶ, καὶ υἱῷ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ σὺν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι δόξα (Now to God the Father, and to our Lord the Son Jesus Christ, with the Holy Spirit, be glory).<sup>4</sup> The leading terms are clearly τῷ θεῷ and τῷ κυρίῳ, with πατρὶ and υἱῷ serving as their adjuncts. Inasmuch as *both* of the leading terms again have an article, this passage likewise presents no exception to Sharp's Rule.

A fourth example is once more from the writings of Clement of Alexandria: τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπου (of God and man).<sup>5</sup> This phrase is similar to those previously cited from Aristotle's *Ethics*. Winstanley admits that ἀνθρώπου is used in a general sense, referring to pious Christians. As such, it is not a necessary exception to Sharp's Rule, which is limited to nouns of personal description. Furthermore, no confusion could possibly arise from an omission of the article before the second noun, for the terms "God" and "man" are mutually exclusive.

Winstanley's fifth example, from the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, does admittedly appear to be an exception to the rule: μεθ' οὗ δόξα τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ καὶ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι (with whom be glory to God and the Father and the Holy Spirit).<sup>6</sup> One would indeed have expected a repetition of the article before ἁγίῳ πνεύματι. Yet its absence here could hardly result in ambiguity, for the distinction between the first and third persons of the Trinity was apparently deemed too clear for any confusion

to arise. This is not the case with the four passages in the New Testament which are the object of our present study. The presence or absence of the article before the second noun in them would indeed have a crucial effect upon the interpretation!

The last "exception" cited by Winstanley occurs in the Septuagint's translation of Proverbs 24:21: φοβοῦ τὸν θεόν, υἱέ, καὶ βασιλέα (Fear God and the king, O son).<sup>7</sup> The translators of the Septuagint appear in many places to have been overly servile to the Hebrew text, translating into Greek at times with an almost slavish literalism. In this verse the Hebrew text lacks an article before the word for "king." That the Septuagint should also lack the article is therefore not surprising -- especially since the two nouns, "God" and "king," are so distinct that no confusion could possibly have arisen through the omission of a second article.

The "exceptions" to Sharp's Rule are thus found to be highly unconvincing. None of them occur within the books of the New Testament itself, and most of them, if not all, are found upon examination to be no exceptions at all. We remember also the remark of a "distinguished critic," that "when a rule has been established by ninety-nine examples out of a hundred, an exception in the hundredth will not overturn it."<sup>8</sup> Our review of Winstanley's book could, it seems, stop at this point. For his subsequent rejection of Sharp's exegesis of the passages in question is based largely upon his belief that he has demonstrated that the rule is severely limited by exceptions. But I shall nevertheless proceed with some comments on his exegetical methods and conclusions.

Ephesians 5:5: ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ (in the kingdom of the Christ and God). Winstanley insists that the noun χριστός must be construed as a proper name in this passage, and that the phrase τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ is therefore exempted from the operation of Sharp's Rule. Before he would be willing to accept Sharp's exegesis, that the Son is here called both "Christ" and "God," he would want to find at least one such expression in the New Testament as ὁ χριστός καὶ κύριος for "Christ the Lord," or Ἰησοῦς ὁ χριστός καὶ κύριος, "Jesus, the Christ and Lord." (p. 47)

Winstanley would probably find it quite difficult to

prove his assertion that τοῦ Χριστοῦ must be taken as a proper name in Ephesians 5:5. It is frequently employed in the New Testament as a noun of personal description, or appellative, and the fact that it occurs with the article in our verse makes it probable that Paul is here using it as such. If the apostle had written instead τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ, with Χριστοῦ in second position and without an article before it, then Winstanley's argument would be far more convincing.

It is unfortunate also that Winstanley refuses to accept Sharp's exegesis of τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ unless he can be shown a similar phrase employing the noun κύριος instead of θεός. It must indeed be granted that the phrase τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ is a novel expression in the books of the New Testament, but should this fact prevent us from taking it in the sense demanded by Sharp's Rule? A lengthy list could no doubt be made of phrases which are employed only once in the New Testament, but their rare occurrence would surely not cause us to set aside valid grammatical principles as we seek for the meaning intended by the holy writers.

2 Thessalonians 1:12: κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (according to the grace of our God and Lord, Jesus Christ). Winstanley begins his discussion of this verse as follows: "I cannot think that St. Paul intended to denominate one person only in this passage, because *first*, in the Septuagint when these words κύριος and θεός are ascribed to one person, the connexion is made without the copulative; κύριος ὁ θεός, ὁ κύριος ὁ θεός, *the Lord God* -- κύριος ὁ θεός ἡμῶν, *the Lord our God*. St. Paul had only to adopt this arrangement, with which he must have been sufficiently acquainted, and the whole would have been incapable of any other sense than that which you [Sharp] attribute to it." (p. 53f.) Paul was indeed no doubt well acquainted with the phrases from the Septuagint which Winstanley here cites, yet he chose not to use them anywhere in his epistles, either of the Father or of the Son. Is Winstanley being fair, then, when he suggests that Paul should have employed them here, had he wanted to denominate one person only in our passage? What we *do* find in a reading of Paul's epistles is that he regularly used the idiom described by Sharp when he wished to refer two nouns of personal description to the same individual. Is

it really so strange that he selected this idiom for our verse?

Winstanley continues: "But, *secondly*, had he preferred the insertion of the copulative to designate the same person, it is highly probable that he would have chosen a different arrangement, so as to preserve to the noun κύριος its usual construction; τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which would also have determined, beyond dispute, the application of θεοῦ." (p. 54) While Winstanley is correct in observing that the phrase "our Lord and God" was more commonly used of Christ in the early years of the Christian church than the phrase "our God and Lord," this fact in no way compels us to remove 2 Thessalonians 1:12 from the application of Sharp's Rule. As we have seen,<sup>9</sup> Christopher Wordsworth was able to find a number of passages in the writings of the Greek fathers which employ the very phrase "our God and Lord" as a reference to Christ. As to the New Testament itself, there is only one passage which refers to Christ in which the opposite arrangement occurs, namely John 20:28: ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου (my Lord and my God). Moreover, if the phrase θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου of James 1:1 be allowed as a reference to Christ,<sup>10</sup> then there would be one further passage in the New Testament which would present the arrangement of words that we find in our passage: "God and Lord."

"*Lastly*," Winstanley continues, "If to these arguments be added the consideration that St. Paul frequently employs the noun θεός absolutely in direct contradistinction to our Lord Jesus Christ ... ; and that your [Sharp's] rule is liable to various and indisputable exceptions, you may perhaps think that an impartial reader may have sufficient reason to add the passage at the head of this discussion to those exceptions." (p. 56) In answer to this, one need only point out that there is no reason, theological or doctrinal, why Paul should not have referred to Christ as "God" in our passage, and that it is simply not true that Sharp's Rule is liable to "various and indisputable exceptions." Winstanley is not able to prove a single clear exception to this rule in the entire volume of the New Testament!

Titus 2:13: τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (of our great God and Savior, Christ Jesus). Winstanley first chooses to introduce a comma

after θεοῦ, and then argues that μεγάλου applies to both θεοῦ and σωτήρος, and that this explains why the article is not repeated. This surely seems rather forced, for while it would not be at all unusual to speak of "the great God," the expression "great Savior" would be highly unlikely. But even if we should grant that μεγάλου referred to both nouns, would Sharp's Rule indeed no longer apply? Even Winstanley is forced to admit quite candidly that "it is very rare to meet with nouns personal in the singular number, constructed as above; I mean with an article and adjective common to two following nouns, relating to *different* persons." (p. 68, my emphases) This is virtually an admission that according to the normal rules of grammar both nouns, "God" and "Savior," should be applied to "Christ Jesus." It is significant that Winstanley is willing to set aside "the natural and obvious sense" of a passage in his attempt to find what he feels is the author's "true sense." (cf. p. 70) Such an approach can easily lead to a form of *eisegesis* -- interpreting a passage according to the exegete's idea of appropriateness of meaning or expression, rather than according to the actual grammatical construction of the passage itself.

One remaining argument which Winstanley brings against Sharp's exegesis of Titus 2:13 serves as an illustration of this wrong kind of Biblical interpretation. He states: "The words τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ have in themselves a just claim to be considered as one of the pre-eminent and incommunicable titles of God the Father. It is more agreeable to the general tenor and language of scripture so to regard them." (p. 68) This is nothing else than a biased theological presupposition!

2 Peter 1:1: ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (by the righteousness of our God and Savior, Jesus Christ). Winstanley admits that according to the grammatical construction of the passage Sharp's exegesis would be correct -- both nouns, "God" and "Savior" would apply to "Jesus Christ." The parallelism of expression in verse 11 (τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) would, he says, support this conclusion. But once again he feels constrained to reject this interpretation on the basis of what he calls "the broad principles of general criticism." (p. 65)

What are these "broad principles" which he chooses

in preference to the narrow grounds of grammatical accuracy? The first is this: "The attributes *Lord* and *Saviour*, applied to the same person, are usually connected by the copulative; but the nouns  $\omega\tau\eta\rho$  and  $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$  are as regularly connected without it ..., and therefore the interposition of the copulative must appear to render St. Peter somewhat ambiguous." (p. 65) But the words  $\omega\tau\eta\rho$  and  $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$  occur together without an intervening  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  only seven times in the whole New Testament, and not one of these occurrences is in the writings of Peter. Does "general criticism" indeed teach us to conclude that because two words, not necessarily connected at all, are used in one way a half-dozen times, they cannot be used in another way, when that other way is fully agreeable to the idiom of the language and to good sense?

Winstanley continues: "It will be said, why then do you [Winstanley] not understand him [Peter] according to the prevailing idiom of the language? I answer, because he appears to me to have explained himself in the very next verse,  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\gamma\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \text{'}\text{I}\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ . It is not very probable that he would thus, in immediate consecution, use the words God and the Saviour Jesus Christ, and, God and our Lord Jesus Christ, first to signify one person, and then two; without any assignable reason for so remarkable a difference." (p. 65f.) Surely Winstanley is aware of the grammatical difference between these two verses, the second passage adding an article after the copulative  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ :  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \text{'}\text{I}\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ . Apparently he does not think it "very probable" that two different meanings should be expressed by two different grammatical forms!

The exegetical vagaries indulged in by Winstanley in so many places of his book prompt a few additional remarks before we move onward in our study of Sharp's Rule and the four passages. First a word in behalf of grammatical interpretation in the exegesis of Holy Scripture. T. F. Middleton, in the preface to his significant treatise, *The Doctrine of the Greek Article*, expresses it well: "To the Grammatical interpretation of the N.T. every sensible and unbiased Christian will give his strenuous support. When, indeed, we consider how many there are who seek to warp the Scriptures to their own views and prepossessions, it seems to be the only barrier which can be opposed successfully against



heresy and corruption. Partial Versions may be framed, and false Expositions sent forth into the world: but these cannot, if the friends of religion accurately study the original of the Scriptures, long mislead mankind. It was the judicious admonition of one of the Fathers, and the lapse of centuries has not abated its force or propriety, ἡμεῖς οἱ πιστοὶ παρ' ἑαυτοῖς ἐξετάσωμεν καὶ βασανίσωμεν τῶν ῥημάτων τὴν ἀκριβείαν [Let us who believe on our own part examine and test out the accuracy of the things which are spoken]."<sup>11</sup> Winstanley disparages such grammatical interpretation and sets it aside repeatedly in his interpretation of Scripture. The result is that his own "views and prepossessions" have come to influence the direction of his exegetical conclusions. And these conclusions he presumptuously labels as the "true sense" of the holy writers!

Surely an observance of the usage of the definite article is an important part of the grammatical interpretation of the New Testament, for the presence or absence of an article often has a significant effect upon the meaning. It can, moreover, surely be demonstrated that the evangelists and apostles were not as capricious and arbitrary in their use of the definite article as Winstanley suggests. According to such grammarians as Middleton and A.T. Robertson, these writers probably always had a reason for using or not using an article in a particular passage. It is true, of course, that we may not always be able to determine the reasons for their usage -- the use of the article with proper names being a case in point.

But there is surely no reason why we should be in doubt concerning the meaning of the holy writers when they employ that idiom which is described by Sharp's Rule. For it is indeed one of the most firmly established of all the rules which pertain to the usage of the article. If, for the sake of argument, we temporarily exclude the four passages presently under study, there are no exceptions to the rule in the entire New Testament! Winstanley, now, suggests that our four passages are such exceptions. But does he realize that this suggestion involves an implicit denial of the integrity of the writers, Paul and Peter? For these apostles employed the idiom with great frequency, and with an obvious understanding and appreciation of its force. If they had now used this idiom in these four verses in a manner contrary

to the force which it clearly has in the remainder of their writings, they could indeed be justly charged with inexcusable carelessness, if not with deliberate deception. Or, to put the matter somewhat differently, if the writers had not intended to identify Jesus Christ with "God" in these verses, they surely expressed themselves in a manner which they must have known would mislead their readers. But, of course, such a situation could not be possible, inasmuch as they were writing by inspiration of the Holy Spirit!

(to be continued)

C. Kuehne

#### FOOTNOTES

1. Calvin Winstanley, *A Vindication of Certain Passages in the Common English Version of the New Testament* ... (Liverpool: W. Jones, .1805).

2. The passage can be found near the end of Plato's sixth epistle, addressed to Hermeias, Erastus, and Corsicus. The later citations are in Clement's *Stromata*, chap. 14, and in Origen's *Against Celsus*, book VI, chap. 8.

3. Book III, chap. 75.

4. Winstanley identifies this reference only as follows: "See note in Burgh's Enquiry, 359."

5. Winstanley fails to identify the precise location of this quotation in the writings of Clement.

6. Chapter 22.

7. This verse is quoted in the interpolated *Epistle of Ignatius to the Smyrneans*, chap. 9.

8. In Mr. Marsh's *Letters to Mr. Travis*, p. 257. Cited by Middleton on p. xlv of the preface to his book on the Greek article. See footnote 11.

9. Cf. *Journal of Theology*, March, 1974, p. 16f.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 19f., footnote 1.

11. Thomas Fanshaw Middleton, *The Doctrine of the Greek Article* (Cambridge: J. & J.J. Deighton, 1833), p. xxxix. In the next issue of this *Journal*, I shall, God willing, present Middleton's views with respect to Sharp's Rule and the four passages which we are studying.

---

A STUDY OF JOSHUA

## (Conclusion)

III. The Distribution of the Land and Joshua's Last Days, Ch. 13-24.

The second half of the Book of Joshua mainly describes for us the distribution of the land among the tribes of Israel, namely, Reuben, Gad, and half of Manasseh (Ch. 13); Judah (Ch. 14:6-15, Caleb's inheritance; Ch. 15, the tribe of Judah); Ephraim (Ch. 16); half of Manasseh (including the daughters of Zelophehad, Ch. 17); Benjamin (Ch. 18); Simeon, Zebulun, Issachar, Asher, Naphtali, Dan (Ch. 19:1-48) and Joshua's inheritance (Ch. 19:49-51). Then follow the commands concerning the cities of refuge (Ch. 20), concerning the dwelling-places which were to be given to the Levites (Ch. 21); the report concerning the unrest caused by the erecting of an altar at the Jordan river by the two and a half tribes who would continue to dwell on the other side of the Jordan, and concerning the God-pleasing settlement of this unrest (Ch. 22). The book then closes with Joshua's exhortation to the elders and officers of Israel (Ch. 23), as well as to all of Israel (Ch. 24:1-28), and with a few words concerning his and Eleazar's death and burial, as well as the burial of Joseph (Ch. 24:29-33).

Chapter 13. Joshua was to begin the distribution of the land because he "was old and stricken in years," and there still remained very much land to be possessed. God Himself wanted it thus (Josh. 13:1), and He described to Joshua how much territory was yet to be conquered. These instructions sounded as though it were already in Israel's hands. For Joshua was to die before the entire land would actually be in Israel's hands. To be sure, Joshua might certainly have prayed for a lengthening of his life, until all the work would be completed. By such a prayer he would be asking for nothing more difficult than when he prayed that the sun might stand still. Later on King Hezekiah prayed that the Lord might add to his life, and his prayer was granted (2 Kings 20:1-6). God could have done this even without Joshua's prayer, and could have bestowed on him so much strength and vigor that he could easily have managed the Anakims, the Philistines,

and the Geshurites in his old age. But here we are to learn yet another important and necessary truth. When God chooses to call us out of this life, we should not think that it is still too early, for I, I must still do this and that, otherwise it will not be done in the right way. God surely finds the people and the means to finish any work which He has laid on us and which we have carried out until now. Moses led Israel up to the Jordan, but someone else led them across. David had rest from his enemies and was ready to build an house for the Lord and was not lacking in good intentions. But he heard that "when thy days be fulfilled," then Solomon was to do it (2 Sam. 7:12-13). The apostles die, but the Church remains. The Lord could preserve and extend His Church through others, even without the Twelve. It is well and good if we are so faithful in our calling that we want to be personally active at all times. However, we should be ready to lay down our hand whenever God calls us away, and to commend to Him the continuation of our work up to that time.

We now learn how Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh received the inheritance allotted to them already by Moses (Josh. 13:15-32). Reuben was indeed the firstborn. But his tribe did not receive a double portion (according to Deut. 21:17) of everything on hand. Only now, after more than 300 years, the punishment for Reuben's misdeed (Gen. 35:22 and 49:4) in its results passed upon his descendants. Reuben's right of the first-born passed over to his brother Joseph who received two portions, one for Ephraim and one for Manasseh. But no particular land inheritance was given to the tribe of Levi by either Moses or Joshua, for "the Lord God of Israel was their inheritance, as He said unto them" (Josh. 13:33).

Chapters 14-15. The land was divided by lot, as the Lord had commanded through Moses (Num. 26:53). "To many thou shalt give the more inheritance, and to few thou shalt give the less inheritance: to every one shall his inheritance be given according to those that were numbered of him. Notwithstanding the land shall be divided by lot: according to the names of the tribes of their fathers they shall inherit" (Num. 26:54f.). And "every man's inheritance shall be in the place where his lot falleth" (Num. 34:54). Thereby any argument was prevented. But this did not do away with the special privi-

lege which God through Moses had once promised to Caleb (Deut. 1:36), who with Joshua had remained faithful. "To him will I give the land that he hath trodden upon, and to his children, because he hath wholly followed the Lord." So Caleb now had a right, before lots were cast and before the other children of Judah had their turn, to claim beforehand the beautiful and glorious inheritance promised to him 45 years earlier. He did this in a wonderful speech, in which he gave God the glory, called upon Joshua as a witness ("thou heardest in that day," Josh. 14:12), and designated the mountain of Hebron as the future inheritance of him and his descendants. Joshua blessed him and gave it to him for an inheritance. He was 85 years old when he received his allotted inheritance, "and lo, as yet I am as strong this day as I was in the day that Moses sent me: as my strength was then, even so is my strength now, for war, both to go out, and to come in" (Josh. 14:11). For war, he says. For it would still be necessary for him to fight. The Anakims still lived there. Great and mighty cities were still there, "if so be the Lord will be with me, then I shall be able to drive them out, as the Lord said" (Josh. 14:12). And he did drive them out, as we read in detail in Josh. 15:13-19. Thus Caleb is a wonderful example of steadfast faith, and his godliness received also the promise of the life that now is (1 Tim. 4:8).

The inheritance of the tribe of Judah is described for us, first, according to its borders (Josh. 15:1-12), and then according to the cities belonging to it (Josh. 15:21-62). It is then mentioned in v. 63 that the Jebusites could not be driven out of Jerusalem by the children of Judah, but dwell with them there "unto this day."

Chapters 16-19. From the account concerning the distribution of the land among the remaining tribes of Israel (Ch. 16-19), several particulars stand out as being worthy of special consideration.

In the tribe of Manasseh, Zelophehad had died in the wilderness without male heirs, but had left behind a number of daughters. On their behalf Moses had brought their cause before the Lord (Num. 27:1-11) and had received the answer that the inheritance of their father was to pass on to these daughters. Since the distributing of the land was now to take place, they appeared before Joshua and Eleazar, the priest, and succeeded in ob-

taining their inheritance among the brethren of their father according to the law of a daughter's inheritance (Josh. 17:3-6). -- In a similar manner the tribe of Joseph succeeded in being apportioned not just one lot and one portion, but a double lot, because Ephraim's and Manasseh's descendants were "a great people." Thus also Jacob's blessing (Gen. 48:5) was fulfilled. But it certainly seemed (Josh. 17:14-18) that the children of Joseph had something to do to see their right recognized.

After bringing the tabernacle of the congregation to Shiloh (Josh. 18:1), Joshua complained at an assembly of the congregation of Israel concerning the lack of zeal among the remaining seven tribes who had not yet received an inheritance, but had remained silent in the distribution. Joshua ordered a sort of land registration and topographical survey of the land still appertaining to Israel, to be conducted by a commission of three men from each tribe. These "passed through the land, and described it by cities into seven parts in a book, and came again to Joshua to the host at Shiloh. And Joshua cast lots for them in Shiloh before the Lord: and there Joshua divided the land unto the children of Israel according to their divisions" (Josh. 18:2-10). In any case, here is the first trace of an exact map of the land. The opinions of exegetes still vary widely as to the mode of determining the individual inheritances by lot.

Just as Caleb's inheritance was determined first, so Joshua's was last (Josh. 19:49-50). According to the Lord's command, they gave him "the city which he asked," namely, Timnathserah. -- Thus Joshua and Eleazar and the heads of the fathers among the tribes made an end of dividing the country (Josh. 19:51).

The distribution of the land shows that Israel remained chiefly a people engaged in farming. In Israel there was no so-called landed proprietor "who alone possessed the land," and who alone could determine the price of their produce. On the other hand, it certainly was not communism that was here introduced. According as the lot fell, the one received "a south land," the second received land "with springs of water" (Judg. 1:15). No Spartan-like rule stated a maximum portion of land which was not to be exceeded under any circumstances. But firm boundaries were kept in view from the outset, for each tribe as well as for each family, as Moses had already

commanded: "Thou shalt not remove thy neighbor's landmark, which they of old time have set in thine inheritance, which thou shalt inherit in the land that the Lord thy God giveth thee to possess it" (Deut. 19:14). Again: "Cursed be he that removeth his neighbor's landmark. And all the people shall say Amen" (Deut. 27:17). -- It is evident that Israel's civil law cannot and should not be that of other countries, even though the Mosaic Law is the basis of all natural righteousness and justice. It should also be noted how the "laws of return" were in effect in the year of jubilee. All these things served the purpose of requiring a careful accounting of the real estate, and compelling a limitation of rubbish and a keeping of poverty at a minimum. When someone's allotted land fell in a charming region and was a "goodly heritage" (Ps. 16:6), that person had special reason not to be ashamed of poor gleaners (Cp. Book of Ruth).

When we read in Josh. 15:63, 16:10, and other places of the inhabitants of Canaan whom the children of Israel did not drive out, and whom they could not drive out, then the explanation for this latter is not to be found in the numerical strength and natural invincibility of the Jebusites, but in the great sins of Israel mentioned in Judges 2 and 3, especially its idolatry. They "followed other gods, of the gods of the people that were round about them" (Judg. 2:12). Without these and similar sins (e.g. marriage with members of those tribes destined to be destroyed), there would have been no objection to God's inconstant toleration. For we read in Deut. 7:22 - "And the Lord thy God will pluck off those nations before thee by little and little: thou mayest not consume them at once, lest the beasts of the field increase upon thee." These passages dare not be disregarded, if one is rightly to understand and judge the account in Judges 1.

It is also deserving of special attention to note how the blessing and the curse of the patriarch Jacob, as well as the blessing of Moses, were fulfilled in the distribution of Canaan. We need refer to only a few points. In Jacob's blessing Ephraim was given preference among Joseph's sons (Gen. 48:14). So the tribe of Ephraim was allotted its inheritance first by Joshua (Josh. 16), and afterwards the inheritance was allotted to the large tribe of Manasseh (Josh. 17). Furthermore, concerning Simeon and Levi, whose swords had turned into weapons of

murder at Sichem, Jacob had said: "I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel" (Gen. 49:7). This was fulfilled in Josh. 19:1-9, where we read: "Out of the portion of the children of Judah was the inheritance of the children of Simeon: for the part of the children of Judah was too much for them: therefore the children of Simeon had their inheritance within the inheritance of them." Thus Simeon had no continuous, geographically designated piece of land belonging to him alone, but the cities allotted to him were scattered and dispersed in the territory of the tribe of Judah. -- And Jacob's word was also fulfilled in Levi, although in a different way. This tribe, as it were, had made amends when it served Moses, when Moses had called out after the idolatry with the golden calf: "Who is on the Lord's side?" (Ex. 32:26). Nevertheless, Levi's inheritance was still "divided in Jacob and scattered in Israel," although neither to its shame nor to that of all Israel.

But Shiloh in Ephraim (Josh. 18:1), where at least the last seven tribes had not yet received their inheritance, remained hereafter a most important place in Israel's history. The reason was that the tabernacle of the congregation was located there. Thus it was the only legal location for the offering of sacrifices. Even Samuel's parents came there every year (1 Sam. 1:3). The tabernacle remained there until Eli's sons took the Ark of the Covenant with them into battle (1 Sam. 4:3-11).

The fact that Joshua received his inheritance last of all, and then not an exceedingly large inheritance, prompts us to make yet another practical application. In the Fourth Petition we pray, among other things, for pious and faithful rulers. Such pious rulers will not seek their own personal gain in the office they hold. They will above all seek that which is best for the people, with all faithfulness! Such rulers will not come off too badly if they themselves will keep in mind when saying the Fourth Petition that the pronoun is in the plural. There are all too many people also today for whom the principle: "The will of the king is the supreme law" (*Voluntas regis suprema lex esto*) stands higher than the other principle: "The welfare of the people is the supreme law" (*Salus populi suprema lex esto*).

Chapter 20. The Lord had commanded the children of Israel through Moses that after the conquest of the land



there should be six cities of refuge (Num. 35:6). This command, too, was now carried out. Kadesh in Galilee, Shechem in Mount Ephraim, and Kirjatharba (or Hebron) were appointed for this purpose in the lands west of the Jordan. Bezer, Ramoth, and Golan were appointed in the lands east of the Jordan.

One of the very first ordinances after the solemn proclamation of the Ten Commandments provided for a future law concerning cities of refuge (Ex. 21:13), and this is dealt with in detail both in Num. 35 and Deut. 19. These passages, compared with Josh. 20, give a clear picture of the purpose and value of these cities of refuge. When a man killed another person, as Cain killed his brother Abel, then his conscience accuses him, and in fact tells him that everyone who knows about his deed is justified in killing him for the sake of their own safety (Gen. 4:14). God dealt with Cain in a special way so that this would not happen to him (Gen. 4:15). But after the Flood God said: "Surely your blood of your lives will I require; at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man" (Gen. 9:5-6). Wherever there is now a ruling body whom God has decreed to be the revenger toward those who do evil (Rom. 13:4), then this authority handles the sword, and no one has the right to take into his own hands revenge toward the evildoers. But where there is no ruling body, where people live next to each other as hordes without laws, where the father in a family has been given and possesses no jurisdiction beyond his family circle, what then? Feuds quickly arise when a murder takes place. The father seeks to avenge the killing of a member of his family, or the son avenges the killing of the father upon the perpetrators of the deed. If this revenge is not recognized as an act of righteous punishment by the relatives of the murderer, then there will be still more killing and bloodshed. Gradually the continual letting of blood will cause entire families to be sacrificed as victims. This practice continues in the world to this day. That was the practice in ancient days among the people of the Orient by whom Israel was surrounded. And even where there is a ruling body, such blood-feuds are found, as though they consider it to be their rightful and inviolable custom.

Since there remained also in Israel avengers of

bloodshed alongside of the ruling body, therefore the law concerning the cities of refuge was put into effect. It was customary to make a distinction between deliberate and accidental killing. In the case of a deliberate killing, the law of Israel offered no shelter. There the death penalty was carried out. The avengers were the closest male relatives of the murder victim, and they were thereby the legal servants of the ruling body. The government, not the avengers themselves, had to determine whether murder or accidental killing had taken place. Outside of Israel, the fact that a killing had taken place was usually all that was necessary to start an avenger hunting down the perpetrator of the deed. But the Mosaic law granted the careless slayer a right of sanctuary in the city of refuge which was located closest to him.

Entry to a city of refuge was to be well prepared, according to Deut. 19:3. It should be in a good enough location so that it would be possible for the slayer to reach it before the avenger could overtake him. For if he catches up with him and kills him "while his heart is hot" (Deut. 19:6), then the avenger does not remain exempt from punishment. When the fugitive came to the gate of the city of refuge, then according to Josh. 20:4 he was to stand at the entering of the gate of the city before the elders who go to meet him under the gate, and explain his cause to them. We are not told if they would refuse him admission if he disclosed something in his report indicating he was guilty of deliberate murder. Usually the fugitive was considered guilty of having killed accidentally. The elders would then take him into the city, not turning him over to the avengers following him. The fugitive would then stand "before the congregation for judgment." He received his orderly trial. When the situation was such that only one witness accused him of deliberate murder, then he was not to be handed over (Deut. 19:15; Num. 35:30). There were times when the trial could conveniently be completed in the city of refuge itself. At other times it took place at the location of the slaying. In such cases, the fugitive would be brought there under secure protection. If he was found guilty of having killed only carelessly or unintentionally, he was again brought back to the city of refuge (Num. 35:25). If he was guilty of deliberate murder and the fugitive was still in the city of refuge,

then the authorities of his home town would request that he be delivered to them (Deut. 19:12), and they themselves would deliver him to the avenger of blood. While other bodily injuries are associated with the saying: "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," and a person thus injured would permit himself to be compensated by a sum of money, the avenger of blood could "take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer, which is guilty of death: but he shall surely be put to death" (Num. 35:31). Reason: the blood polluted the land, and "blood defileth the land: and the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it" (Num. 35:33).

This principle was deeply impressed upon the conscience of Israel. Also in the second situation, when an accidental slaying took place, the fugitive was to live in exile in the city of refuge until the death of the priest then functioning (Num. 35:32). He could not go beyond the boundaries of the city of refuge (Num. 35:5) without endangering his life from an overly-zealous avenger lying in wait. Only after the death of the officiating high priest was he again permitted to return to his homeland, and he was then safe from the avenger.

Why wait until the death of the high priest? Here we are only able to conjecture, for Scripture gives no reason. It would of course be completely absurd to attribute any atoning significance to the death of the high priest. On the basis of Ex. 21:14 it is imagined that during the time of wandering in the wilderness, and even through the conquest of Canaan, the tabernacle and the altar were to serve as a place of refuge. Furthermore, only cities given to the priests could serve at the same time as cities of refuge (Num. 35:6). This was apparently behind the determination that the return of the fugitive was made dependent on the death of the high priest.

In any case, whether the high priest's death followed sooner or later, the unintentional slayer was out of sight from the family of the slain man for that amount of time. His enforced absence must have been very clear and unflinching testimony that the blood of man is precious in the sight of God, and that even when it is shed unintentionally there is obvious punishment that follows.

Whoever goes to the trouble of comparing the Mosaic right of sanctuary with that of the heathen (or even with

that of the ancient and mediæval church), will easily and quickly see where the greatest system of justice and good sense is to be found. And yet it seems that here too God had to make allowance for the hard-heartedness of Israel, just as He did in the marriage law through the ordinance of a bill of divorce. It appears that there were no provisions to punish: 1) the avenger who killed an unintentional slayer before his arrival in the city of refuge, and 2) the avenger who met and strangled such an one outside the boundaries of the city of refuge, before the death of the high priest during whose period of office the slaying had taken place. Such a person was not thereby innocent before God, and sooner or later had to stand before the highest Judge.

Chapter 21. In addition to the six cities, which were to serve at the same time as cities of refuge, the tribe of Levi was allotted 42 others, so that altogether 48 cities belonged to this tribe. The tribe also received the land immediately surrounding each city, its "suburbs" (Josh. 21:2). This chapter enumerates all these cities. The determining of these cities had to take place as soon as the other tribes had been allotted their territory. At the time of this determining, a number of these cities were not as yet under their control and had to be conquered first. But it appears that it was not always possible to do this. This would be the simplest explanation for the fact that the list of Levite cities to be found in 1 Chron. 6:54-81 is not completely identical to the list here in Josh. 21.

The "dispersion" of the tribe of Levi among the other tribes of Israel happened in fulfillment of the last words of Jacob, as we have seen. At the same time, it was a work of wisdom and a blessing of God upon Israel in general and toward the tribe of Levi in particular. Every Israelite now found close at hand (and not just at the sanctuary of the tabernacle or temple) a man who was well-versed in the Law and service of the Lord. He could quickly give advice. He soon found the lepers on whom the Lord had shown mercy and absolved them of their leprosy. If some hard-hearted Israelite intended to separate from his wife, not for reasons of adultery but because she had otherwise grown in disfavor with him, and wanted to give her a bill of divorce, there was now in the priest and Levite a man who was well-versed in the Law, who could give him wise counsel, set before him the

results of his action, and warn him to remember the divine institution of marriage. We can imagine many situations in the public and domestic life of the Jewish people where it was of great benefit to have quickly the advice and assistance of a man from the tribe of Levi. -- And for the tribe of Levi, on the other hand, it was a sign of God's blessing that it was not directed to be completely dependent upon the tithes of nature which Israel owed the Levites. In times when idolatry prevailed among the populace in Israel, then the Levites still had their lodging. And within the boundaries of the 48 cities there was sufficient land for them to cultivate to provide for their own daily bread in time of need.

Chapter 22. By this time Joshua's life-work was actually completed. The occupation and distribution of the land were completed, as far as it was possible for either to be done. "The Lord gave unto Israel all the land which He swore to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it, and dwelt therein. And the Lord gave them rest round about, according to all that He swore unto their fathers: and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them; the Lord delivered all their enemies into their hand. There failed not aught of any good thing which the Lord had spoken unto the house of Israel; all came to pass" (Josh. 21:43-45).

Therefore Joshua could now also dismiss with a fatherly exhortation and with his blessing the two and a half tribes who had their dwellings on the east side of the Jordan river, and who for years had helped their brethren to win their inheritance (Josh. 22:1-9). But now, before they crossed over the Jordan, they (the children of Reuben, of Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh) built "a great altar." They did not thereby wish to erect a place to offer sacrifices, an altar in the true sense of the word. Nor had they forgotten the Lord's command (Deut. 12:13), much less did they wish to transgress that command. They only wished to establish a monument, which would testify that they had in common with their brethren on the other side of the Jordan one Lord, one faith, one confession, the same sacrifice and worship. Their only mistake was that they did not previously speak of this and explain it. As a result they gave offence and caused some to imagine that they had sinned in erecting that altar and that they wished to turn away from Jehovah. When they were now called to

give an account of this, they attested with the holiest of oaths (Josh. 22:22) concerning the purity of their intentions, that with this monument they wanted to record this very fact: "We also have part in the Lord, even though we live on the other side of the Jordan." All Israel was satisfied with this explanation. All thoughts of making war on the two and a half tribes on account of the altar were set aside. The monument remained standing as a witness of the confession of the people on both sides of the river, that "the Lord is God" (Josh. 22:34).

Civil government is ordained by God not only for the punishment of the evil-doers, but also "for the praise of them that do well" (1 Pet. 2:14). That is shown by Joshua's beautiful song of praise upon the departure of the two and a half tribes (Josh. 22:2-3). At the same time, it was a plea to remain steadfast in the way of the Lord, therefore the exhortation in vv. 4 and 5. -- Considering Israel as a whole, there had never been a time that God's people had shown a purer and more beautiful zeal for the Lord's honor than at this time. Ever since the days of Peor's crime and Achan's sacrilege, the fear of coming under the wrath of the living God had characterized the people. They earnestly endeavored not to anger the Lord and not to sin against Him. Love to their brethren according to the flesh was not as important to them as zeal for the pure doctrine and true religion. The first table preceded the second. Blessed times indeed!

Chapters 23-24. A long period of time had now elapsed since the two and a half tribes had gone peacefully to their dwelling-places on the other side of the Jordan. These last two chapters of the Book of Joshua describe how Joshua admonished the people of Israel and held his last assembly at Shechem. Whether the admonition contained in Ch. 23 took place at the next to the last gathering of Israel (or only to its representatives, its elders, judges, and officers) cannot be definitely determined, although Ch. 24:1 seems to suggest this. In any case, it is foolish to conclude that here two accounts from various sources were clumsily patched together. Both addresses by Joshua share in common the remembrance of the great grace and blessing which Jehovah had shown to Israel, and the exhortation to remain faithful to the Lord and not fall away from Him. But while the first still holds before their eyes the disastrous

results of an eventual falling-away, the latter ends in a challenge to the entire assembly of Israel (Ch. 24:15): "Choose you this day whom ye will serve ... As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord." Israel then confessed: "We will also serve the Lord; for He is our God" (Josh. 24:18); "God forbid that we should forsake the Lord, to serve other gods" (v. 16).

Was it not wonderful that they confessed so joyfully and unanimously to the Lord? Certainly. They surely spoke in all sincerity in this solemn, exalted moment in which Joshua who was "this day going the way of all the earth" (Josh. 23:14), exhorted them for the last time. But had not their fathers (Ex. 20:19 and many other times) promised the same thing, and had they not quickly turned aside from the right way? For that reason Joshua reproached them once more, that it is impossible to remain faithful to the Lord by human powers, that the enthusiasm of that moment of trusting in their own powers would not last long in achieving the goal of steadfastness. After he had held out to them the greatness of His promise, the people again declared: "The Lord our God will we serve, and His voice will we obey" (24:24). Joshua made a formal and solemn covenant with them and "took a great stone, and set it up there under an oak, that was by the sanctuary of the Lord. And Joshua said unto all the people, Behold, this stone shall be a witness unto us; for it hath heard all the words of the Lord which He spake unto us: it shall be therefore a witness unto you, lest ye deny your God. So Joshua let the people depart, every man unto his inheritance" (Josh. 24:26-28).

The Book of Joshua comes to an end with the note that Joshua died at the age of 110 years and was buried in the border of his inheritance in Timnath-serah, where he had resided since completing the distribution of the land at Shiloh; that furthermore the bones of Joseph (already before this time) found their last rest at Shechem (Josh. 24:32); and with the report of the death and burial of Eleazar, the son of Aaron, the high priest of Israel.

The instruction of the sons of Korah, in Psalm 44: 1-3, was composed in David's time, and is a beautiful summary of the time of Joshua. With words of thanksgiving it confirms what was said in Josh. 24:31: "We have heard with our ears, O God, our fathers have told us, what work Thou didst in their days, in the times of

old. How Thou didst drive out the heathen with Thy hand, and plantedst them; how Thou didst afflict the people, and cast them out. For they got not the land in possession by their own sword, neither did their own arm save them: but Thy right hand, and Thine arm, and the light of Thy countenance, because Thou hadst a favour unto them."

A. Schulz

Correction: One line was inadvertently omitted in the preceding article of this series. In the March 1974 issue, page 34, please insert the following words between the fourth and fifth lines at the top of the page: "that Israel could not use horses and chariots against their enemies, but".

---



---

B O O K   R E V I E W

The Long Day of Joshua -- and Six Other Catastrophes,  
by Donald W. Patten, Ronald R. Hatch, and Loren C. Steinhauer; Pacific Meridian Publishing Co., Seattle, Washington; November, 1973; 328 pages; \$9.00.

In the growing list of books and articles which have swelled the market, we find a similar growth on themes which bear on the general theme of creationism versus uniformitarianism-evolution. The Long Day of Joshua is another such addition to this area. Its emphasis is the period of history from the flood (about 2500 B.C.) to about 700 B.C. One of the three authors, Donald W. Patten, has been heard from before as editor of several Symposium on Creation volumes reviewed previously. He is also well known for his book, The Biblical Flood and Ice Epoch, published in 1966. One might describe the latest publication as a sequel to his earlier book.

It is contended that the cause of numerous catastrophic events in that period -- including the Tower of Babel, the Exodus, and the Long Day of Joshua, to mention



three of a long list -- were caused by Mars. Mars supposedly had an orbit which intersected that of the earth, having catastrophic effects upon the earth during periodic close "fly-bys". Others before Patten, Hatch, and Steinhauser have had similar theories including Immanuel Velikovsky, whose book Worlds in Collision has been around for some 20 years. However, by contrast, the Long Day of Joshua is a book whose basic premise is an acceptance of Scripture in all its aspects -- be they historical or scientific in impact.

The authors have developed a plausible mechanism in their approach to this period of history. Even assuming no major flaw of a physical nature is demonstrated in the future, it is apparent that proof of this theory is impossible.

One shadow cast upon this book by Patten's earlier volume is the overemphasis on mechanism almost to the complete exclusion of creation. In The Biblical Flood and Ice Epoch, while refuting the many unscriptural theories and espousing a creationist-catastrophic viewpoint, Patten opens the door to vast ages before the beginning. He seems to be so intent on a mechanism for any and all of the events of early history that one is left with the feeling that he is unwilling to accept Genesis 1:1 and is again seeking a mechanism rather than just letting God say, "Let there be ..." It is only fair to say, however, that The Long Day of Joshua, though mechanistic in approach, is not flawed by the inclusion of pre-creation ages.

It is interesting to note some of the unanswered questions of history which can be explained by means of this theory: 1. the asteroid belt beyond Mars, 2. calendar questions related to the 360 - 365 day year, 3. why the Greeks knew about the two moons of Mars, but in our age they were not discovered until almost 300 years after the telescope in 1877, 4. some cyclical patterns of historical events.

It can certainly be said that this astral approach has much to offer in showing how the events of history might well have been brought about by God's omnipotent hand; whether such speculation is wise is debatable. Those who felt that Patten's other book was worthwhile should similarly approve of this one.

# C O N T E N T S

VOLUME 14

JUNE 1974

NUMBER 2

"GOSPEL REDUCTIONISM" .....	1
J. Lau	
THE LOVE IN ROMANS 16:17-18 .....	11
C. Kuehne	
THE GREEK ARTICLE AND THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST'S DEITY (Part IV) .....	16
C. Kuehne	
A STUDY OF JOSHUA (Conclusion) .....	26
A. Schulz	
BOOK REVIEW: "The Long Day of Joshua -- and Six Other Catastrophes" .....	39
J. Pelzl	

---

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, payable in advance. The month of subscription expiration is indicated on the address label.

Issues are dated: March, June, September, December.

Editor-in-chief: Prof. C.M. Gullerud  
Immanuel Lutheran College  
Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701

Managing Editor: Prof. John Lau  
507 W. Grover Rd.  
Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701

Contributing Editors: A. Schulz, C. Kuehne,  
M. Galstad, P. Nolting.

All correspondence regarding subscriptions, renewals, and changes of address, should be directed to the Managing Editor. Correspondence regarding material printed in the Journal should be addressed to the Editor-in-chief.

---