

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

I Timothy 4:15

Journal
of
Theology

Church of the Lutheran Confession

VOLUME 15

MARCH 1975

NUMBER 1

THE PRIVATE CARE OF SOULS

(Conclusion)

In the preceding issue of this *Journal* we spoke of the pastor's office as a Seelsorger. This word beautifully describes the purpose of his office: not only to proclaim the Word of God publicly, but also privately to exercise proper spiritual care of the souls entrusted to him. We also spoke concerning the old custom of private Communion announcements, and how the pastor might well make use of this custom to better care for the souls of his flock. We shall now conclude our thinking on this subject by considering two additional areas in which each Seelsorger should strive to improve his private care of souls.

III.

The pastor has an especially suitable time and opportunity for the private care of souls when he is visiting the sick and the dying.

Here our dear Father in heaven has not left us in doubt as to what medicine we are to use. Those who are physicians of souls have been bound, as it were, to a suitable cure in dealing with their patients.

When people are experiencing good days and times of prosperity and good health, then it is often the case that they go about so unsettled in heart and mind that the pastor can scarcely reach them. But when a sheep desires its shepherd, when a person who is sick with sin also becomes sick in his body and desires its physician, then the true Seelsorger should by all means be at the bedside of the sick and the dying. It may well be that the pastor will have no greater opportunity to be of service to this individual in gaining the soul for the Savior than by this visit. If a pastor neglects this opportunity through his own fault, then he has lost a great advantage, and his influence as a caretaker of souls will be greatly diminished. He needs to keep in mind that his may very well be the last opportunity he will have to help this person onward to true repentance and saving faith.

Ideally, the members of the flock will be trained to inform their pastor immediately when sickness exists, and will request his services. But the pastor should not visit the sick only when he is asked to do so. If he hears from some other source that someone is sick, he would do well to check into it immediately so as to offer his services to them. One can conceive of circumstances when the pastor should call on the sick and the dying only when he is asked to do so; for example, in the case of excommunicated members, public despisers of the Word of God, and people who are completely unchurched. At the same time, if a pastor has some hope that such an one can now at last be helped, then he should not hesitate to go also there uninvited.

What about a situation in which a person is sick with some contagious disease? Here we are reminded of the words of our Chief Shepherd, when He said: "He that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth ... The hireling fleeth, because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep," John 10: 12-13. The possibility of contracting some contagious disease should not hinder a true Seelsorger from caring for the sheep entrusted to his care. This is not to suggest that he need not exercise proper precautions by way of cleanliness, etc. Such precautions should be considered self-evident.

A true Seelsorger would do well to visit also the children when they are sick. This will give him the opportunity to practice the very necessary art of presenting the basic truths of our Christian faith in such simple words that even the sick child will benefit from it. By calling upon children when they are sick, the pastor does so not only for the sake of the children, but also for the sake of their parents. It is possible that parents may be tempted to murmur and complain against God when their child becomes sick. In such a case, the pastor can help the parents to commend their well-being and that of their sick child to the good and gracious will of God, in case it should be His will to take the soul of the child to Himself in heaven.

When we enter a sick room, either at a home or in a

hospital, we do not want to give the impression that now the important minister is there. It is not appropriate for a pastor to come forcefully, overwhelming the sick person with spiritual words of wisdom. Rather, he should come with a friendly greeting, inquire sympathetically concerning the sickness and well-being of the sick person, and assure him of his heartfelt concern. Then he should show that he is indeed the caretaker of the sick person's soul. He will want to remind the person that sickness and suffering come from God, for the Savior assures us: "The very hairs of your head are all numbered," Matthew 10:30. He should call to remembrance that God sends sickness on account of sin. "As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned," Romans 5:12. And the pastor will surely wish to point out that all sickness serves for our real good. "We know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose," Romans 8:28. The pastor will remind the sick person that we should think about our death; that this world will pass away; that we should repent of our sins and seek forgiveness in Christ, etc.

Since the pastor is a physician of souls, he will therefore try to search out the condition of the sick person's soul. He will be especially concerned about determining whether the person recognizes that he is a poor sinner, whether he believes in the Lord Jesus Christ, whether he is steadfast in hope, is comforted in God and His Word, and is ready and prepared to die -- or whether the opposite is the case. The pastor will be concerned about doing the most important things first. He will seek to determine whether the person's illness has affected his thinking, so as to make sure that he would be in a condition to partake of the Lord's Supper. He will wish to ascertain whether the person's condition permits him to talk very much. If the pastor is permitted very little time to talk, he will want to make good use of that time, not wasting it on small talk that is of no value.

As a rule, the pastor does well to talk with the sick in a conversational manner, rather than in the tone of voice he uses when delivering a sermon from the pul-

pit. It is entirely appropriate for the pastor to pray with the sick person. A prayer from a Prayer Book may be entirely suitable. But here the pastor has a good opportunity to make use of *ex corde* prayers, thus making the prayer individualized to the circumstances which exist right there in that room.

In times of sickness, and especially in the case of illnesses that extend over a long period of time, there is one thing that is particularly in place, and that is comfort. During a long illness, the pastor will have many opportunities to show from passages of Scripture the gracious purpose of God in such circumstances. At the same time, the pastor may also find it necessary to gently chastize the individual for his impatience, his complaining, etc.

It is not in place for a pastor to speak too freely to a sick person about his hopes for a recovery. After all, he is not in a position to know what God's will may be for that person, and whether a full recovery is an assured thing. Rather, he will be concerned above all about preparing that person for death, if that should be the will of God in the unforeseeable future.

The Lord's Supper can do much to strengthen a person spiritually in time of sickness. This Sacrament makes it possible for the pastor to minister to the sick in the same manner as our Lord Jesus. When a man sick of the palsy was brought on a bed to the Savior, Jesus said unto him: "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee," Matthew 9:2. Having healed the sickness of his soul, Jesus then went on to heal the sickness in his body. So we are to use the Lord's Supper to assure the person that his sins are indeed forgiven him in Jesus Christ, and that he can therefore be of good cheer. But the pastor should not offer the Lord's Supper to a sick person if he has reason to believe that he is neither ready nor worthy to receive it, I Cor. 11:27-29.

In the case of an individual who is dying, the Seel-sorger will try to help that person to set his house in order, II Kings 20:1. This means that he will try to direct the thinking of that dying person away from the things of this world to heavenly things. "For here have

we no continuing city, but we seek one to come," Hebrews 13:14. He will direct the person to Christ and proclaim to him the message of forgiveness of sins and salvation. Such a person will then find his thoughts reflected by the Psalmist: "As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God: when shall I come and appear before God," Psalm 42:1-2. From the heart he prays to the Holy Spirit for steadfastness in the faith unto the end, for he believes that divine promise: "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life," Rev. 2:10. As his end draws near, he commends his body and soul into the gracious hands of God, saying, as did the dying Savior: "Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit," Luke 23:46. Clinging to his Savior and beholding Him with the eyes of faith, he can confidently say: "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word: for mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared before the face of all people," Luke 2:29-31.

In short, every dying person should be directed to Jesus Christ, no matter what the circumstances of his life may have been until that time. It is well to speak to him passages and prayers that are familiar to him, when this is possible. When he no longer seems to understand what you are saying, then talk loudly to him. We are told that the sense of hearing remains with a dying person the longest of any of his senses. What precious opportunities a true Seelsorger thus has to carry out his God-given responsibilities in the private care of souls!

IV.

Finally, let us direct our attention to one more area in which the pastor can and should minister privately to blood-bought souls. If his work is to be done properly, then house calls will be an important part of his ministry.

As a shepherd, the Seelsorger must necessarily learn to know his flock. By this we mean that he should learn to know each individual sheep and lamb. A pastor, therefore, should not merely study his books, but he should

also study his sheep. To do this realistically, he should study them not merely when they are dressed in their Sunday clothes, but also in their everyday work garments.

There are, of course, some things that the pastor should avoid in making house calls. He should avoid making such a call at a time that is entirely inopportune for the people involved. He might do well to find out from the people ahead of time when would be the most suitable time for him to come, as far as they are concerned. The pastor will certainly wish to avoid giving the impression that he prefers to visit those homes where there is something to enjoy by way of diversion or pastime. Business before pleasure! The Lord Jesus made a house call on Matthew. How very pleased He was to have the publicans and sinners coming in also to hear the words of salvation from His lips. As His followers, we will especially cherish the house call which provides us an opportunity to direct people to the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.

In making house calls, the pastor should also avoid familiar associations with young women and daughters, especially when the pastor is still young in years. The apostle Paul had good reason to write as he did to young Pastor Timothy: "Intreat ... the elder women as mothers; the younger as sisters, with all purity," I Timothy 5:2. And again Paul writes (in the words of Beck's translation): "Keep away from such people. Some of them get into homes and captivate weak women, loaded with sins, driven by all kinds of desires," II Timothy 3:5-6. Oh, how the unbelieving world rejoices when a young pastor succumbs to temptation, even though this is an everyday occurrence among the ungodly! But let us hasten to add that the same care should be exercised by pastors who are older. A person doesn't have to read very far into the daily newspaper to come to the conclusion that indeed "there is no fool like an old fool."

It goes without saying that a pastor will not wish to have the reputation of being a jokester. In an effort to gain popularity and to give a down-to-earth appearance, some pastors seem to think that they must have a never-ending storehouse of jokes, witticisms, etc., to

share with all the people with whom they come in contact. In our opinion, people will have more respect for a pastor who proclaims, not side-splitting jokes, but the Word of God which shows troubled sinners the way to heaven. It may well be that such pastors will not hold top spot in any popularity contest, but then we do not expect to fare any better in this department than did our Savior, as we follow in His footsteps.

In planning his house calls, the pastor will wish to visit especially those who have been involved in any kind of misfortune or loss. If he knows of some individual who is beset by some spiritual danger or temptation to the soul, then he will by all means wish to call upon that person without delay. For example, he may know that some individual is in danger of falling prey to some false-teaching church, unchristian fellowship, or lodge. Or perhaps some individual members are unclear about a particular truth in God's Word, to the point that they are troubled over it. Here is the pastor's opportunity to dig into the Word of God with them. Or if an individual is tempted to despair in the midst of trouble and affliction, the pastor should not miss the opportunity to apply the Word of God to the particular situation.

What can the pastor talk about in making house calls? He will put his time to good use when he inquires about the family devotions and the material that is used; the table prayers; the edifying books they have to read; the discipline and obedience of the children. He might inquire concerning the prayers of the children; the studies of the school-age children; their behavior toward eventual employers, etc. In all things, the pastor should give to each one whatever is necessary for the furtherance of his salvation and spiritual life.

In conclusion, we shall make but one additional comment. That person is the best master of the art of being a true Seelsorger, a true caretaker of souls, who learns rightly to distinguish Law and Gospel, and who learns rightly to apply both to the individual. This is very often a difficult task, for it is not always possible for us to know the thinking of a person's heart. Therefore, as we go about our task of caring for the souls of men, both in public and in private, we ask our

Lord to fill us with His wisdom, so that we may be His instruments in guiding souls along on that narrow path which leads to heaven.

A. Schulz



THE GREEK ARTICLE

AND THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST'S DEITY

(Conclusion)

II. Colwell's Rule and John 1:1

The preceding six articles in this series have dealt with the Rule of Granville Sharp and its application to several New Testament passages which involve the doctrine of the deity of Christ. In this concluding installment we shall focus our attention particularly upon Colwell's Rule and the interpretation of John 1:1.

This passage reads as follows in the Greek text: 'Εν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. Its translation, in the familiar *King James Version*, is as follows: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." Many of our readers, however, realize that this translation has been widely challenged by Unitarians of every age. The Jehovah's Witnesses, for example, translate the last portion of this verse as follows in their official version, the *New World Translation of the Christian Greek Scriptures* (1950): "... the Word was a god." A four-page defense of this rendition is found in an appendix to this version. The Jehovah's Witnesses, of course, make much of the fact that the noun θεός lacks a definite article ὁ (the) in the Greek. Their arguments will be examined later below.

Colwell and His Rule

It is indeed legitimate to ask why the article is not used in this passage, if indeed the meaning of the

Greek is "the Word was God (definite)" rather than "the Word was a god (indefinite)." It is a well-known fact of Greek grammar that an anarthrous (lacking a definite article) noun in Greek may be either definite or indefinite, its definiteness or indefiniteness depending on the context in which it is found. Or, to put it somewhat differently, a noun in Greek does not always require the article even when it is clearly definite. The question confronting us in John 1:1 is whether or not we may in this context interpret the anarthrous θεός as definite.

Some of the clearest light to be shed upon this question in recent years appeared in 1933 in an article by Dr. Ernest Cadman Colwell entitled "A Definite Rule for the Use of the Article in the Greek New Testament."¹ Colwell, who was then on the faculty of the University of Chicago, states the rule in brief form early in his presentation (p. 13):

A definite predicate nominative has the article when it follows the verb; it does not have the article when it precedes the verb.

Colwell presents a sizable amount of evidence in support of this rule. The passage that first attracted his attention was John 1:49. "In this verse," Colwell observes, "Nathanael ascribes to Jesus two titles; in one of them he uses the article, in the other he does not: σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ' σὺ βασιλεὺς εἶ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ [You are the Son of God; you are the King of Israel]. What reason is there for this difference? When the passage is scrutinized, it appears at once that the variable quantum is not definiteness, but word-order. 'King of Israel' in this context is as definite as 'Son of God.' It seems probable that the article is used with 'Son of God' because it follows the verb, and is not used with 'King of Israel' because it precedes the verb. If this can be established generally in the New Testament, it will of course involve only those sentences in which the copula is expressed." (p. 13)

In his attempt to show that his rule does describe accurately the general usage of the Greek New Testament, Colwell cites several groups of passages, in each of

which a predicate nominative is used now with the article and now without it. Here is one example: "The words 'Son of God' appear approximately thirteen times as a predicate with the article; in each of the thirteen passages they follow the verb. These words also appear ten times as predicate nominatives without the article; in nine of these passages they precede the verb, and in the tenth (Matt. 27:43) it may be significant that θεοῦ precedes the verb." (p. 13f.)²

The title "Son of Man," according to Colwell, is used twice in the New Testament as a predicate nominative. In Matt. 13:37 it has the article: ὁ σπείρων τὸ καλὸν σπέρμα ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (The one sowing the good seed is the Son of Man); in John 5:27 it lacks the article: καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κρίσιν ποιεῖν, ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν (And He gave Him authoritative power to render judgment, because He is the Son of Man). Significantly, in the former passage, where the predicate noun has the article, it follows the verb; in the second, where it is anarthrous, it precedes the verb. This variation in the use of the article, Colwell states, frequently occurs with the same phrase in the same book. Compare John 8:12 with John 9:5. In the former passage we find: ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου (I Myself am the Light of the world). We note that the predicate noun, "the Light of the world," follows the verb and has the article. The second passage reads: ὅταν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ᾖ, φῶς εἰμι τοῦ κόσμου (As long as I am in the world, I am the Light of the world). Here the predicate noun precedes the verb and does not have the article. But clearly, the predicate in this latter passage is fully as definite as in the former!

Colwell finds a significant example of the correlation between word order and the use of the article in Matt. 13:37-39, where Jesus gives His interpretation of the parable of the tares. In this passage seven definite predicate nouns are found. The first five of these nouns follow their verbs, and in each case they take the article. The last two predicates precede their verbs, and both of them lack the article. Here is the passage: ὁ σπείρων τὸ καλὸν σπέρμα ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (The one sowing the good seed is the Son of Man); ὁ δὲ ἀγρός ἐστὶν ὁ κόσμος (and the field is the world); τὸ δὲ καλὸν

σπέρμα, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας (and the good seed, these are the sons of the Kingdom); τὰ δὲ ζιζάνια εἰσιν οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ (and the tares are the sons of the evil one); ὁ δὲ ἐχθρὸς ὁ σπείρας αὐτά ἐστιν ὁ διάβολος (and the enemy who sowed them is the devil); ὁ δὲ θερισμὸς συντέλεια αἰῶνός ἐστιν (and the harvest is the end of the world); οἱ δὲ θερισταὶ ἄγγελοι εἰσιν (and the reapers are the angels). A similar syntactic arrangement occurs in Matt. 23:8-10. Colwell concludes that Matthew changed from one word order to the other merely for the sake of variety. "In neither of these Matthean passages can it be claimed that the predicates which close the series are less definite or concrete than those which precede; nor are the final clauses of the series less convertible than the others." (p. 14f.)

That Colwell did his research with care appears from the tabulated information which he includes in his article. These tables indicate that while his rule is not without exception in the New Testament, yet it is descriptive of the general usage of the holy writers. He located 367 passages in which the predicate noun was beyond any doubt definite. In 255 cases these definite predicates followed the verb, and 229 or 90% of them had the article, while only 26 or 10% lacked it. In 112 cases the definite predicates preceded the verb, and 97 or 87% of them lacked the article, while only 15 or 13% had it. (p. 17) Colwell cites support for his rule also from such sources as the Septuagint and the Greek church fathers.

On the basis of his findings, Colwell formulates tentatively the following rules to describe the use of the article with definite predicate nouns in sentences in which the verb occurs (p. 20):

- 1) *Definite predicate nouns here regularly take the article.*
- 2) *The exceptions are for the most part due to a change in word-order:*
 - a) *Definite predicate nouns which follow the verb (this is the usual order) usually take the article;*
 - b) *Definite predicate nouns which precede the verb usually lack the article;*
 - c) *Proper names regularly lack the article in*

the predicate;

- d) *Predicate nominatives in relative clauses regularly follow the verb whether or not they have the article.*

He concludes that "it is in the realm of translation and interpretation that the data presented here have their most valuable application. They show that a predicate nominative which precedes the verb cannot be translated as an indefinite or a 'qualitative' noun solely because of the absence of the article; if the context suggests that the predicate is definite, it should be translated as a definite noun in spite of the absence of the article. In the case of a predicate noun which follows the verb the reverse is true; the absence of the article in this position is a much more reliable indication that the noun is indefinite. Loosely speaking, this study may be said to have increased the definiteness of a predicate noun before the verb without the article, and to have decreased the definiteness of a predicate noun after the verb without the article." (p. 20f.)

Reactions to Colwell's Rule

Has Colwell's Rule stood the test of time and further investigation? It is still probably too early to predict whether or not it will become a generally accepted canon of Greek grammar. C. F. D. Moule, in his *Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*, cites it with the comment that Colwell "has made important observations" on the matter of the article.³ Nigel Turner, in vol. III of the Moulton grammar series, likewise cites the rule and adds: "Obviously if such a rule stands the test, it is valuable for textual decisions and translation."⁴

It must be recognized, of course, that Colwell's Rule is not without exception when an examination is made of New Testament usage. In this respect it differs from Sharp's Rule, which is without a single demonstrable exception. Yet Colwell's Rule does hold in the large majority of cases. Surely we can state without the slightest hesitation that the predicate noun θεός in John 1:1 may be definite even though it lacks the article, inasmuch as it is found before the verb in its clause. Whether or not it is indeed definite ("God" rather than "a

god") will be discussed below.

Application of Colwell's Rule to Exegesis

In the accounts of the temptation of Christ, found in Matt. 4:1-11 and Luke 4:1-13, Satan twice prefaced his temptation with the words: εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ. Robertson regards the anarthrous predicate noun as indefinite ("if you are a son of God"). He states: "The devil is represented as admitting that Jesus is a son of God, not the Son of God."⁵ According to Colwell's Rule, however, the clause may be translated: "if you are the Son of God." This, in fact, seems more probable. The condition is of the first class, one of assumed reality. That is, it assumes that the condition is true, whether or not it is true in actual fact. Thus Satan would, in effect, be saying to Jesus: "Assuming now that you are the Son of God, then ..." The subtlety of such a temptation is readily apparent. Satan hoped that Jesus would feel compelled to prove that He was in fact the very Son of God in whom the heavenly Father was well pleased. In support of this exegesis we have similar syntactic arrangements in passages like Matt. 5:35, ὅτι θρόνος ἐστὶν τοῦ θεοῦ (for it is the throne of God), and John 10:2, ὁ δὲ εἰσερχόμενος διὰ τῆς θύρας ποιμὴν ἐστὶν τῶν προβάτων (but he who enters through the door is the shepherd of the sheep) -- in both of which passages the anarthrous predicate nouns are apparently definite. Compare also John 10:36, where Christ refers to His own claims as to His Person: υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ εἰμι. Here the predicate is surely definite: "I am the Son of God."

In Matt. 27:40 the words of Christ's enemies are recorded, as these enemies stood beneath the cross: εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, κατὰβηθι ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ. Once again the anarthrous predicate noun preceding the verb appears to be definite. It does not seem at all unlikely that these foes were casting Jesus' own words into His face: "If you are the Son of God, come down from the cross." For Jesus had answered affirmatively when at His trial a few hours before He was asked: εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (whether you are the Christ, the Son of God). (Matt. 26:63) Here, of course, the article is used with the predicate noun, inasmuch as it follows the verb.

Then we have the words of the centurion beneath the cross after Jesus' death: ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν οὗτος. (Matt. 27:54) According to Colwell's Rule, there is no grammatical reason why one should not put into the Roman officer's mouth the full confession: "Truly this one was the Son of God." Colwell states: "The evidence given in this paper as to the use of the article with predicate nouns strengthens the probability that the centurion recognized Jesus as the Son of God (so Weymouth and the older English translations), rather than as a son of God." (p. 21)

Colwell's Rule and the Exegesis of John 1:1

Colwell's Rule obviously applies to John 1:1 as well. On this passage he says: "The opening verse of John's Gospel contains one of the many passages where this rule suggests the translation of a predicate as a definite noun. Καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος looks much more like 'And the Word was God' than 'And the Word was divine' when viewed with reference to this rule. The absence of the article does not make the predicate indefinite or qualitative when it precedes the verb; it is indefinite in this position only when the context demands it. The context makes no such demand in the Gospel of John, for this statement cannot be regarded as strange in the prologue of the gospel which reaches its climax in the confession of Thomas [John 20:28, 'My Lord and my God']. " (p. 21)

Turner agrees fully with Colwell's exegesis of John 1:1. He states in his *Grammatical Insights*: "Dr. Moffatt, in a version which is now more generally recognized as brilliant paraphrase than as skilful translation, ... changed St. John's proclamation that 'the Word was God' into an ambiguous assertion that 'the Logos was divine' (John 1:1). The implication is that even human persons may be called divine, in a sense. Dr. Moffatt considered that he had Greek grammar on his side. The word for God, theos, does not have the definite article; therefore theos is not a noun but a kind of adjective; therefore it must be translated 'divine' and not 'God.' The fallacy of this has been exposed since Dr. Moffatt's time, but he has never lacked a following. The one he would doubtless be most anxious to disown is the utterly unsuitable translation of a German ex-Roman priest,

'the Word was a god.' [The Jehovah's Witnesses have adopted this very translation, and cite Moffatt's 'divine' in support of it.] Understandably, unitarians find difficult the apparent contradiction that in the first verse of the gospel 'God' appears to mean the Father, while it is predicated of the Word in the same verse. Christians may be illogical, but they find no difficulty in thinking that this verse refers to God the Son."

Turner continues: "The claim of unitarians to be logical should of course be respected, but the grammarian will resist their attempts to impress grammatical principles in the service of their cause in a way which is not legitimate. The fact that *theos* has no article does not transform the word into an adjective. It is a predicate noun, of which the subject is *Logos*, and it is a fairly universal rule in New Testament Greek that when a predicate noun precedes a verb it lacks the definite article; grammatical considerations therefore require that 'there need be no doctrinal significance in the dropping of the article, for it is simply a matter of word-order.'"6

Most older grammarians likewise regard the θεός of John 1:1 as definite, although the reason they give for its being anarthrous differs from that of Colwell and Turner. Robertson, for example, states in his *Short Grammar*: "As a rule the article is not used with the predicate noun even when the subject is definite. ... Thus we can tell subject from predicate. Hence in John 1:1 θεός ἦν ὁ λόγος we translate the Word was God, not God was the Word, for subject and predicate are not here co-extensive."⁷ Two of Robertson's pupils, W. H. Davis and W. D. Chamberlain, express themselves in a similar fashion.⁸

In his larger *Grammar*, Robertson suggests furthermore that the article could not have been used with θεός in John 1:1. "It is true also that ὁ θεός ἦν ὁ λόγος (convertible terms) would have been Sabellianism."⁹ (My emphasis.) What Robertson means by this he explains at greater length in an article in the *Expositor* magazine: "If both God and Word were articular, they would be co-extensive and equally distributed and so interchangeable. But the separate personality of the Logos is affirmed by

the construction used, and Sabellianism is denied. ... The Logos became flesh (i. 14), and not the Father."¹⁰ To put it simply, Robertson believes that the use of an article with θεός in the phrase θεός ἦν ὁ λόγος would identify the Word (Christ) with the Father, who has just been referred to in the phrase πρὸς τὸν θεόν. Such an identification of the Persons of the Father and the Son would, of course, involve the old Sabellian error.

The 19th-century grammarian Simcox would not agree with Robertson at this point. In his *Language of the New Testament* he, too, takes anarthrous θεός as definite, but he denies that the use of the article would have involved heresy. He states: "In Jewish and Christian writers, ... θεός is a name belonging to One only, and so is used like a pr. n., with or without the art. according to its place in the sentence: and beyond one or two broad rules, it seems that there is hardly any principle involved in the retention or omission. In John i. 1 *fin.* ὁ θεός ἦν ὁ λόγος would have been much more a solecism [a departure from grammatical principles] than a heresy: θεός is without the art., not because St. John means to teach Arianism (the Word was a divine being), nor because he pointedly does not mean to teach Sabellianism ('God' and 'the Word' were one and the same ...), but simply because ὁ λόγος is subject and θεός predicate, though the latter, as more emphatic, stands first."¹¹ (My emphasis.)

Dana and Mantey in their *Manual Grammar* carry forward the line of interpretation begun by Robertson. They emphasize, and rightly so, that the basic function of the Greek article is to point out individual identity. When the article is not used with a noun, it may still be definite, but it is the nature or character of the person or thing that is thereby stressed. "When identity is prominent, we find the article; and when quality or character is stressed, the construction is anarthrous."¹² These generalizations concerning the use and nonuse of the Greek article are indeed correct, and can be very helpful in one's exegetical practice. Dana and Mantey choose, now, to apply them also to John 1:1: "Πρὸς τὸν θεόν [the Word was 'with God,' an article is used] points to Christ's fellowship with the person of the Father; θεός ἦν ὁ λόγος ['the Word was God,' no article] emphasizes Christ's participation in the essence of the divine

nature. The former clearly applies to personality, while the latter applies to character. This distinction is in line with the general force of the article."¹³ (My emphases.) This exegesis seems to be reflected in Kenneth S. Wuest's *The Gospels: An Expanded Translation*: "And the Word was as to His essence absolute deity."

The interpretations of Robertson and Dana-Mantey are surely within the analogy of Scripture; they conform fully to sound doctrine. But can these interpretations be defended in view of the findings of Colwell? The present writer believes that they can not. From the examples cited by Colwell, it is probable that the non-use of the article before θεός in our passage is the result of nothing more than the word order chosen by the apostle. To inject doctrinal considerations into the exegesis (Robertson), or to emphasize a qualitative force in the noun θεός (Dana-Mantey), may involve the placing into the text of something that is not actually there.

Surely it must be noted, now, that in our verse the noun θεός is written first in its clause, thereby securing for it a position of emphasis. The holy writer wishes to underscore the fact that this "Word" of whom he has spoken is Himself "God." Several of the newer translations have caught this emphasis. In Charles B. Williams' *The New Testament: A Translation in the Language of the People* and in the Lockman Foundation's *The Amplified New Testament*, we read: "... and the Word was God Himself." *The Living Bible Paraphrased* translates in a similar fashion: "He ... is himself God." Since, now, the word θεός is written first for emphasis, it must of necessity come before the verb. Why it is then written without the article is amply explained by Colwell in his rule. To the present writer this seems to be the simplest and most natural explanation of the anarthrous θεός in our passage.

Regarding the Jehovah's Witnesses on John 1:1

Space does not allow a point-by-point refutation of the afore-mentioned defense of the Jehovah's Witnesses for their translation, "the Word was a god." They cite Dana-Mantey in support of their exegesis, but wrongfully so. When these grammarians speak of the anarthrous noun θεός as emphasizing nature or essence, they are surely in

no way suggesting that Christ's deity is in some way subordinate to that of the Father. The Jehovah's Witnesses leap upon Dana-Mantey's translation "and the word was deity," and construe it to mean that Christ was merely "a god." But Dana-Mantey themselves exclude such a perversion of the text by adding: "... nor was the word all of God, as it would mean if the article were also used with θεός. As it stands, the other persons of the Trinity may be implied in θεός."¹⁴

It is almost beyond belief when this sect cites even the venerable grammarian A. T. Robertson in defense of their exegesis. As we saw above, Robertson found in the fact that θεός is anarthrous a safeguard against an anti-trinitarian interpretation which would regard the Father and the Son as constituting one and the same divine Person. But the Jehovah's Witnesses turn Robertson's words into another type of anti-trinitarianism, namely, the subordination of the divine nature of the Son to that of the Father.

It is strange that this sect cannot see how its particular doctrine involves it in a type of polytheism. Scripture teaches one God in three Persons. But the Jehovah's Witnesses teach that the deity of the Father differs in essence from that of the Son. Only the Father, they assert, is the God; the Son is for them merely a god. But would there not, then, be two deities, a superior and an inferior? Let us recognize well, with Simcox above, that in the holy writers θεός is a name belonging to One only, and so may be used like a proper noun with or without an article. Do the Jehovah's Witnesses recognize how often anarthrous θεός is used of the Father in the same Gospel of John?¹⁵ To be consistent, they should in such passages refer to the Father also as merely "a god."

Bruce Metzger presents a further refutation of the Jehovah's Witnesses' arguments: "In a lengthy Appendix in the Jehovah's Witnesses' translation, which was added to support the mistranslation of John 1:1, there are quoted thirty-five other passages in John where the predicate noun has the definite article in Greek. These are intended to prove that the absence of the article in John 1:1 requires that θεός must be translated 'a god.'

None of the thirty-five instances is parallel, however, for in every case the predicate noun stands after the verb, and so, according to Colwell's rule, properly has the article. So far, therefore, from being evidence against the usual translation of John 1:1, these instances add confirmation to the full enunciation of the rule of the Greek definite article.

"Furthermore, the additional references quoted in the New World Translation from the Greek of the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, in order to give further support to the erroneous rendering in the opening verse of John, are exactly in conformity with Colwell's rule, and therefore are added proof of the accuracy of the rule. The other passages adduced in the Appendix are, for one reason or another, not applicable to the question at issue."¹⁶

The Modern Translations

For the most part, the modern translations have rendered John 1:1 in a satisfactory way, generally with the words "and the Word was God." There are, however, a few notable exceptions. *Good News for Modern Man (Today's English Version)* translates: "... What God was, the Word also was." Perhaps it has here followed the lead of the *NEB*: "... and what God was, the Word was." At best these are very weak paraphrases. Goodspeed's *American Translation* is even more objectionable: "... and the Word was divine."

III. Some Concluding Remarks

Throughout the centuries Satan has been seeking to destroy the confidence of Christians in the full deity of Christ. His efforts have extended to almost every verse in the New Testament which teaches this doctrine. With the highest degree of subtilty he has tried to set aside the clear testimony of Scripture through misrepresentations of grammar or through rational appeals.

It has been this writer's privilege to explore the meaning of a total of five of these much maligned passages. The result, hopefully, has been a reaffirmation of their Spirit-intended sense, as they give to our Savior

the precious name of "God."

This much we should note well, as we go about our exegetical endeavors in the Scriptures of the New Testament. The holy writers, such as Paul, Peter, and John, do ascribe the name θεός to Christ, contrary to the preconceived notion of only too many expositors. Let us be done, once and for all, with the kind of procedure illustrated by H. C. Dodd in his commentary on Romans 9:5. He rejects the application of the term "God" to Christ in this verse chiefly because "such a direct application of the term 'God' to Christ would be unique in Paul's writings."¹⁷ Unique? Hardly! And even if it were unique, this still would not be adequate reason for rejecting this verse offhand as a proof passage for Christ's deity. The method of Sanday and Headlam in the ICC on Romans is much more commendable. On the basis of grammar and context they conclude that the word "God" in Romans 9:5 most naturally refers to Christ. They regret that "the question has been somewhat obscured on both sides by the attempt to prove that St. Paul could or could not have used these terms ['God,' 'over all,' 'blessed'] of Christ, i.e. by making the difficulty theological and not linguistic."¹⁸

Perhaps this series of articles has underscored the importance of grammar in the work of an exegete. The words of Bishop Middleton thus form a fitting conclusion: "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."¹⁹

C. Kuehne

FOOTNOTES

1. Found in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. 52 (December, 1933), pp. 12-21. Interested readers can probably secure copies of this article through their local libraries.
2. The passages having the article before the predicate are Matt. 16:16; 26:63; Mark 3:11; 15:39; Luke 4:41;

- 22:70; John 1:39, 49; 11:27; 20:31; Acts 9:20; I John 4:15; 5:5. Those lacking it are Matt. 4:3, 6; 14:33; 27:40, 43, 54; Luke 4:3, 9; Mark 15:39; John 10:36.
3. C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek* (Cambridge: University Press, 1971), p. 115.
 4. James Hope Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. III *Syntax* by Nigel Turner (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), p. 183.
 5. A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), p. 781.
 6. Nigel Turner, *Grammatical Insights Into the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1965), p. 16f. The inner quotation is from Turner's own *Syntax*, p. 183, cf. footnote 4 above.
 7. A. T. Robertson, *A Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1908), p. 75.
 8. William Hersey Davis, *Beginner's Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (New York: Harper & Row, 1923), p. 63; William Douglas Chamberlain, *An Exegetical Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (New York: Macmillan, 1950), p. 57f.
 9. A. T. Robertson, *Grammar*, p. 767f.
 10. A. T. Robertson, "The Greek Article and the Deity of Christ," *Expositor* (London), series VIII, no. 21 (1921), p. 188.
 11. William Henry Simcox, *The Language of the New Testament* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1889), p. 48f.
 12. H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (New York: Macmillan, 1955), p. 138. Robertson would, it seems, agree with these generalizations, cf. his *Grammar*, pp. 755f., 794.
 13. *Ibid.*, p. 140.
 14. *Ibid.*, p. 148f.
 15. Cf. John 1:18, θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε (No one has seen God at any time).
 16. Bruce M. Metzger, "The Jehovah's Witnesses and Jesus Christ," *Theology Today*, vol. X, no. 1 (April, 1953), p. 75f.
 17. C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1949), p. 152. This volume is part of the *Moffatt New Testament Commentary* series.
 18. William Sanday and Arthur Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1900), p. 237.

- 19.. Thomas Fanshaw Middleton, *The Doctrine of the Greek Article* (Cambridge: J. & J. J. Deighton, 1833), p. xxxix.



FOUR WITNESSES FOR THE DEFENSE OF CHRIST'S DEITY*

TEXT: John 5:31-47.

If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true. There is another that beareth witness of me; and I know that the witness which he witnesseth of me is true. Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth. But I receive not testimony from man: but these things I say, that ye might be saved. He was a burning and a shining light: and ye were willing for a season to rejoice in his light. But I have greater witness than that of John: for the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me. And the Father himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape. And ye have not his word abiding in you: for whom he hath sent, him ye believe not. Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me. And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life. I receive not honour from men. But I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you. I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not; if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive. How can ye believe, which receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour that cometh from God only? Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father; there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?

Jesus' lowly birth and death have been an offense and stumblingblock to many down through the centuries. Already as an infant Jesus was an offense to King Herod, who sought to have Him killed. As Jesus grew, and then entered His public ministry on earth, time and again His life was threatened by the unbelieving Jews. Jesus did not measure up to their misguided expectations. They expected the Messiah, indeed, but they expected him to come with outward pomp and glory. Consequently, when Jesus claimed His equality with God the Father, His unbelieving contemporaries considered the claim preposterous. How dare He claim, "I and the Father are one!"? (John 10: 30) and, "The Father is in me, and I in Him!"? (John 10: 38)

Impossible! Absurd! was the response of the unbelieving Jews to this claim of Jesus. Each time the "carpenter's son from Nazareth" claimed His equality with the true God, it aroused their anger the more. In fact, it was that claim more than any other which led to Jesus' innocent death on the cross. "Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God!"

Among our contemporaries there are equal attempts to kill Jesus for this claim He made of Himself. Since He is gone from the earth, Jesus cannot be killed bodily. And yet they do kill Jesus, in a spiritual way, who deny that He was everything that He claimed of and for Himself. "Jesus is the human man who demonstrated Christ," says Christian Science; "Jesus Christ is a created individual," say the Jehovah's Witnesses. Mormonism states officially, "His Father is greater than he." And Modern Theology thrusts its own sword through Jesus when it teaches Him to be "The world's greatest ethical teacher" and "a master product of evolution." -- In the face of all misrepresentation, accusations, lies, consider now:

FOUR WITNESSES FOR THE DEFENSE OF CHRIST'S DEITY.

Our judicial system demands that the defendant have more than himself as witness, which is no doubt a carry-over from Deuteronomy 17:6, "At the mouth of two witnesses or three witnesses shall he that is worthy of death

be put to death, but at the mouth of one witness he shall not be put to death." Jesus acknowledged this fact, "If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true." But Jesus then proceeded to call not one -- not two-- not three -- but four witnesses in defense of His deity.

WITNESS "There is another that beareth witness of me,
NO. 1 and I know that the witness which he witnesseth of me is true. Ye sent unto John and he bare witness unto the truth." It is strongly in favor of the accused if he can summon for his defense one who is greatly respected by his accusers. For the most part, the Jews respected John the Baptist. They had even sent their own representatives one time to ask the Baptist if he himself were the long-awaited Messiah-Savior, "And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou? And he confessed and denied not; but confessed, I am not the Christ." (John 1:19-20) On the witness stand, so to speak, the Baptist said, furthermore; "This was he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me; for he was before me." (John 1:15) "He it is, who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose." (John 1:27) "And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him ... and I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God." (John 1:32.34)

You may step down, John, and thank you for your testimony to the truth. You were indeed a "burning and a shining light." You gave a clear, distinct, consistent testimony in defense of Jesus' deity!

WITNESS We have a saying that "actions speak louder
NO. 2 than words." Jesus wished to comply with this line of argumentation. He says, "For the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me." On behalf of the Savior, the Accused, I herewith place into evidence no fewer than 35 exhibits -- works which testify to Jesus' Godhead:

1. Water made wine at Cana.
2. Healing the nobleman's son.

3. The miraculous draught of fishes.
4. The man with an unclean spirit healed.
5. Healing Simon's mother-in-law.
6. Healing a leper.
7. Healing the paralytic man.
8. The impotent man healed.
9. The withered hand healed.
10. The centurion's servant healed.
11. The widow's son at Nain raised from the dead.
12. The dumb and blind man healed.
13. Stilling the storm.
14. The Gadarene demoniac healed.
15. The daughter of Jairus raised from death.
16. The afflicted woman healed.
17. Two blind men and a dumb demoniac healed.
18. Feeding the five thousand.
19. Jesus walking on the water.
20. The Syrophenician woman's daughter healed.
21. The deaf and dumb man healed.
22. Feeding the four thousand.
23. The blind man near Bethsaida healed.
24. The demoniac boy healed.
25. Tribute money in a fish's mouth.
26. The healing of the man born blind.
27. The dumb demoniac healed.
28. The crippled woman healed.
29. The man having dropsy healed.
30. The raising of Lazarus from the dead.
31. The ten lepers healed.
32. The blind men near Jericho healed.
33. The withered fig tree (Passion week).
34. Healing the ear of Malchus.
35. The miraculous draught of fishes after His resurrection.

Works such as these were enough to convince Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, who said to Jesus some time earlier, "No man can do these miracles that thou doest except God be with him." (John 3:2) On a later occasion, when the Jews said, "If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly," Jesus answered them, "I told you, and ye believed not; the works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me." (John 10:24) And again, "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works, that ye

may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him." (John 10:37) In effect, Jesus tells His accusers that His works are unassailable, unimpeachable witnesses to His deity!

WITNESS Jesus furthermore told the Jews that "he that
NO. 3 honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father which had sent him." Such a claim sends disbelieving chills up and down the spines of the atheists, agnostics, and antichristian religious cults and sects. But now Jesus has a surprise witness to call to the stand in His defense. Jesus reveals, "And the Father himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me." Just what was it that God the Father had said in witness of His Son's Godhead? At Jesus' Baptism we are told, "And lo, a voice from heaven saying, This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased." And at Jesus' transfiguration what did the Father say? "Behold a voice out of the cloud which said, This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased, hear ye him." Thus the inbiased, unprejudiced listener must nod in silent agreement to Jesus' claim in our text, and in John 8:18, "The Father that sent me beareth witness of me."

WITNESS The attacks against the deity of Jesus are most
NO. 4 often levelled at the Scriptures themselves. Show that the Bible is not true in every detail, and then, supposedly, the whole basis for Christianity goes down the drain! A few weeks ago *Time* magazine had a cover story called, "How True is the Bible?" The author, who must have done much background work for it, began by quoting the suggestion of Bible critics, "that the existence of the Wise Men was merely a preaching device to suggest the import and universality of the astonishing event: GOD BECOME MAN." The author continued by quoting both conservatives and liberals in their approaches to the Scriptures. For all that, he concludes what is not surprising to us, namely, that "recent archeological digging has enhanced the credibility of the Bible..." And, hinting at the barrage of criticism levelled at the Scriptures in recent years, he concludes, "After more than two centuries of facing the heaviest scientific guns that could be brought to bear, the Bible has survived. ... The miraculous can be demythologized, the marvel explained, but the persistent message of the Bible will not go

away ..."

Indeed, it will not go away! For the Bible with its saving message of GOD BECOME MAN in the person of Jesus Christ is the very Word of God. The attacks against the Scriptures are not new. Jesus was familiar with these attacks. And yet, as the Accused on this occasion, Jesus calls those same maligned Scriptures to the witness stand in His defense against the unbelieving Jews, "Search the Scriptures," Jesus tells them, "for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me!" Here Jesus invites His unbelieving skeptics and accusers, and also us, to "search" those Scriptures, "inquire diligently into" and "ransack" them. We are to search the Holy Book as though we were miners searching for gold!

It is impossible to accuse the Bible of perjury in any of its witness. The reason for this is beautifully explained by St. Peter in II Peter 1:16-21:

For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were EYEWITNESSES OF HIS MAJESTY. For he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well-pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount. We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts. Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

The fault, then, is not in this fourth witness to Jesus' deity, the Bible, but it is in the bias and prejudice of its critics! Jesus tells His unbelieving Accusers

The fault, then, is not in this fourth witness to Jesus' deity, the Bible, but it is in the bias and pre-

judice of its critics! Jesus tells His unbelieving accusers that the underlying cause of their blind unbelief was that they received honor one of another, refusing to give to God the honor due to Him! He who does not believe the words of Moses cannot believe the words of Jesus, for they both speak of the same One! Consequently, such people stand self-condemned for their self-honor and proud unbelief!

To summarize: In defense of Jesus' full equality with the Father we have called four unimpeachable witnesses, none of which dare be accused of misrepresentation: 1) John the Baptist; 2) Jesus' works; 3) God the Father Himself; and finally 4) the Holy Scriptures. Each of us must make up his own mind from the evidence brought to bear. It is eternally serious business as to what decision is reached by each individual, for "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned." Case dismissed!

Crown Him the Lord of Heaven,
Enthroned in worlds above,
Crown Him the King to whom is given
The wondrous name of Love.
Crown Him with many crowns
As thrones before Him fall;
Crown Him, ye kings, with many crowns,
For He is King of all. Amen.

Paul Fleischer

** With a few minor changes, this is a sermon delivered by Pastor Paul Fleischer at Our Savior's Lutheran Church, Jamestown, North Dakota, on January 19, 1975. It was submitted to the Journal at the request of members of the congregation.*



DEVOTIONS FROM THE BOOK OF JOBI. Songs in the Night

TEXT: Job 35:9-10.

Songs in the night! Isn't that asking for too much? As the night drags on, one sleepless hour after the other, wouldn't it be more appropriate to expect wailing and whining, grumbling and groaning? Take, for example, the long night of the Viet Nam war. One finds it difficult to think back to the start of it all, but we remember that at first it seemed tolerable, and there was even a certain unity in the country about what was being done, and there was a certain amount of glamour attached to those who got the assignment to go to the scene of battle. But as the war dragged on, a change took place and the whole thing got to looking like one great big nightmare. Should one be able to sing songs in a night like that? The answer is Yes: if God gives us songs to sing in such a night, then we can sing them and we shall.

Think of Job! The enemy came and took his cattle; fire descended and destroyed his sheep and his servants. The Chaldeans came and took away his camels and slew the servants in charge. Scarcely had this news been brought when word came to him that a great wind from the wilderness had descended upon the house where his sons had been feasting and killed them all. Finally he himself was smitten with sore boils from the sole of his foot unto his crown. The last straw came when his wife also turned against him. What more could happen to bring a person down into the pit of despair? Job had held up very well through it all, but even this strong and patient man gave way to the flesh and murmured against God and spoke words that should not have been spoken. Songs in the night? What songs could a man like Job sing in the darkness of his night? Songs of wailing and complaint, perhaps? No, also in his dark woe there were songs of praise and joy and hope to be sung. This is the message of Elihu to Job, and he needed to hear it.

There is a God: The God, the only true God Who is our Maker. To Him Who is the Author of our life we shall

be attentive and give heed. He gives songs in the night! First of all, He gave a song for Adam and Eve to sing in the garden of Eden after they fell into the night of sin and death. It was the song of the promised Seed which should crush the head of the serpent. It was the song concerning the Son of God, the Christ, through Whose atonement paradise has been regained and the image of God restored. It was the song of a faith which clings to the promise which says that God is love and does not desire the death of the wicked, but will give life everlasting for the sake of His Son. Here was cause for Job to sing a song even in the depth of his sorrow. Here is a cause for us to sing a song in the depths of our woe, regardless of the pain we may suffer and the agony we may be experiencing. Remember that God our Maker is able to bestow this gift upon us. Think of the songs that are found in the Psalms -- songs that were sung in the midst of great trial and tribulation! Think of the example of our beloved Savior and His disciples. At the very beginning of the Passion, we read these words, "And when they had sung an hymn, they went out into the Mount of Olives." What do we read of Paul and Silas when they were chained to the cell block? We are told, "At midnight Paul and Silas prayed and sang praises unto God."

Songs in the night? Yes, as God gives them, there will continue to be songs in the night. Even in the night of our discontent there will be songs; even songs of praise, for great is the mercy and grace of our loving God.

Thus will I sing Thy praises here
With joyful spirit year by year;
And when we reckon we are no more,
May I in heaven Thy name adore!
Hallelujah!

II. Knowledge from Afar

TEXT: Job 36:1-4.

Elihu's words to Job are words of wisdom and knowledge. The message is not far-fetched, but it is fetched from afar. There is a difference! To say that his message is far-fetched would be a poor recommendation and

would give no reason for Job to give his attention and consideration to the words spoken. It would mean that the man speaking was giving him no help in his time of distress and affliction; for it would all be beside the point, not applicable and not relevant. The words would be wasted and useless. As witnesses for Christ and as servants in His kingdom, we will be well advised to avoid presenting testimony that is far-fetched; for this is no testimony at all and will not be faithful to the Word of our God.

But, now, doesn't our text say that Elihu fetched his knowledge from afar? This it does, indeed. And it expresses a wonderful truth which should assure the heart of Job. The words fetched from afar for his instruction and guidance were drawn from God, the Maker of heaven and earth, and they reach as far as God's creation reaches and cover all the wonderful acts of God and His counsels from all eternity. What more could an afflicted soul ask for? Here is stability and here is truth which nobody can rise up to deny. The will of Him Who has made us, redeemed us, and sanctified us shall be done, and it shall be done in justice, equity, and righteousness. And when the hand of the Lord is heavy upon us and great tribulation has been visited upon us, as was the case with Job, we shall know that in God's wisdom and righteous judgments it shall all be worked out so that good comes and all will serve to the benefit of God's children, the elect. And when we question this and begin to murmur, as finally also did Job, then we know we are stepping out of line. It is a time for repentance, a time to be turning to the God of grace that we might receive the gift of pardon for Jesus' sake.

Elihu was speaking to Job as a servant of God, and as His mouthpiece. He was speaking as the oracle of God and not with the wisdom of man. And for this reason he could say, "Truly my words are not false; One who is perfect in knowledge is with you." This seems very arrogant for a mortal man to claim. But is it any different from the words of Paul, "But though we or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."? This he could say because he could also say this, "For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it,

but by the revelation of Jesus Christ."

Indeed, thus it should be with every faithful proclaimer of the Word; and thus, indeed, it will be as surely as we speak as the oracle of God, faithful to the Word in its every part, taking our reason captive and bowing to the Holy Scriptures as the inspired Word of God. As you go out as witnesses for Jesus Christ, think of what this will mean, not only for yourself, but to all those who will come under your testimony. Let us, then, take to heart every word of admonition which calls upon us to be prepared to minister to the Jobs of today and of tomorrow. We want to be found as faithful stewards of the mysteries of God. Lord, grant this for our Savior's sake. Amen.

III. The Greatness of God

TEXT: Job 36:24-33.

Someone hearing this text read may have been attracted by the sentence, "He gives food in abundance." I am sure that popularity could easily be won if a formula could be proposed today which would bring down the high price of food and so bring more food to the tables of the people of our country. Surely the subject of food is a very timely and a very popular subject. And we will get to it, but first our attention is to be drawn to the main subject of our text, and that is the word which calls upon us to address God and to call Him great. His greatness is detailed to us in the text by a present action of the wondrous forces of nature which are operated and controlled by our God, Who is the Ruler of the entire universe. Nothing happens here without the will and the Word of the Triune God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. He draws up the water from the earth and again causes the clouds to give forth rain. As a wondrous display of His power and might, He causes the clouds to be charged so that lightnings flash and thunders crash. At such times you have seen the earth light up as far as the eye can behold, and then in another instant (if it be nighttime) all is again enveloped in total darkness. God is pictured as one holding these lightning bolts in His hand and sending them out to strike the mark at His command. The thundering of His pavilion declares to us the

presence of God. When we regard the lightning, the tempest, the tornado, the earthquake, the hurricane, and the power there which no man can resist, we are surely impressed with the greatness of God. We have every reason to sing of the greatness of God!

But do we have reason to praise it? Our text tells us that by these forces and powers of nature God judges the people. Yes, indeed, we can well take note of this that the God of nature, our God, also uses the forces of nature to bring judgment and punishment upon a disobedient people. He may also withhold rain and sunshine so that scarcity of food follows as a judgment. He may permit prices to rise so that we have less food on the table. To all this man, if he is a Christian man, can say, "We have deserved this, and more, by our transgressions." Indeed, if God were to pay us out for our sins, we would have no food on the table at all. But out of the goodness of His heart He has, for Christ's sake, forgiven us all our sins; and as such who accept this in faith we shall even look upon the scarcity of food on the table as a mark of God's love to us. He would remind His children once more that our gifts come from Him and that we should with hearts of faith look up to Him to fill our table with the food convenient to our need. That doesn't mean steak and pie and ice cream, but food convenient to our need. For this we are to be thankful, and be not complaining as is the case with those who believe not in God and pass Him by. We are Christians and should learn to look upon the hard times, as well as the good times, as coming from a loving God, Who above all desires our eternal salvation. Amen.

C. M. Gullerud



B O O K R E V I E W S

Whatever Became of Sin?, by Karl Menninger,
M.D.; New York: Hawthorne Books, Inc.

Why read a particular book? Sometimes the title is captivating; sometimes the author fascinates; sometimes it's a little of both. Billy Graham has made the statement that a person can sit in the pew of many a modern church for an entire year without once hearing the word sin so much as mentioned. What has become of sin? But that poses another question: What would move a noted, world famous psychiatrist to ask such a question and to seek to answer it in a book?

Dr. Menninger answers this question in an "Epilogue," which he calls "The Displaced Preface." He became concerned about the defections from one of the moral leaders of the nation, the clergy. What was causing these defections? After an exhaustive study five principal causes were isolated: "a loss of nerve, a loss of direction, erosion from culture, confusion of thought, exhaustion," p. 224. These conditions in the moral leaders of the nation are the reason why seminarians "are discouraged." All of society is affected. "People are worried." There is a "morality gap," a figure used by the eminent historian, Arnold Toynbee, who made the amazingly frank statement that "science ... has not been able to do anything to cure man of his sinfulness and his sense of insecurity, or to avert the painfulness of failure and the dread of death," p. 227. These conditions in our society moved Dr. Menninger to write a book about "the categorical imperative and the public state of mind and morals," p. 223.

How is a theologian or a knowledgeable layman to read a book like this? He must be aware of the fact that the book has been written from the viewpoint of civic righteousness. The psychiatrist, as well as all his fellows laboring in the area of human behavior, operates with the basic moral equipment of the natural knowledge of God, the natural law implanted in the human heart, and conscience. These theological terms may well be given names in scientific jargon. For example, Freud calls "conscience" the "superego." What the above means

is that any book on human behavior, written from this point of view, has its built-in limitations, for it fails to make use of God's final and superior revelation to man, the gospel of salvation in Christ, which has the power to regenerate and renew man caught in the web of his own sin. Nevertheless, the book has value, for as Christian citizens we, too, should be concerned with the state of public morals. But more, we can learn from the scientific observations of men in the behavioral sciences much about the workings of sin in man. "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" (Jeremiah 17:9) Natural man is equipped to gain insights and understanding of the workings of sin, especially regarding the second table of the law.

Why is Dr. Menninger interested in reintroducing the concept of "sin"? Because something has slipped through the fingers of society, something that is causing the "morality gap" of today. That which has been lost and must be regained is "moral concern" and "personal responsibility," p. 48.

How has this happened? Dr. Menninger shows how over the years what was once called sin and so was a matter of personal concern and responsibility became labeled as crime, a matter for the state to deal with. Think of how abortion was once sin, became a crime, and now has become legal under certain circumstances. Crime has been made a "symptom," not the concern of the government, but of the doctor. Our technological society has given birth to the corporation, which has been defined as an individual that has no conscience. "Group thinking" has freed the individual from moral responsibility. The result of these social and cultural processes has been the loss of moral concern and personal responsibility. The analysis is immediately recognizable as valid.

But what is sin? On pages 18-20 Dr. Menninger presents a section entitled "Definition of Sin." He begins by referring to Webster's definition that "sin is transgression of the law of God; disobedience of the divine will; moral failure. Sin is failure to realize in conduct and character the moral ideal, at least as fully as possible under existing circumstances; failure to do

as one ought towards one's fellow man." Dr. Menninger dismisses the theological overtones of sin as rightly being beyond the scope of his concerns as a psychiatrist and so deals with sin chiefly as it appears in society. There "sin is not against rules, but against people -- and it is the 'against-ness' or aggression in the intent or motivation that constitutes the designation sin," pp. 134-135. Here we need the corrective help of the Word. When David committed adultery with Bathsheba and subsequently tried to cover up his sin by murdering her husband, those were sins of "against-ness" in its most personal form, for to violate a man's wife and then to murder him is the most personal form of "against-ness" that is possible. After he was brought to repentance, David became agonizingly aware of the "against-ness" of his sins, but note how he confessed this: "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight," Psalm 51:3. That sins against one's fellowman are primarily sins against God, Who has set the norm, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," is the dimension that is lacking in the endeavor to reestablish "moral concern" and "personal responsibility."

We do not criticize Dr. Menninger for failing to make this point. We are but pointing out the limitations of a discussion of sin on the basis of civic righteousness. On the other hand, the chapter on "The Old Seven Deadly Sins (And Some New Ones)" is an excellent discussion of sin with applications to the modern scene. Sometimes we tend to forget the moral equipment that our God gave all men, which, unfortunately, most men suppress. A statement like this from Bertrand Russell shows moral insight on the basis of the natural knowledge of the law: "Every man would like to be God if it were possible; some few find it difficult to admit the impossibility," p. 135.

There are some extremely thought-provoking statements along the way that may well challenge the reader's long-held, pet opinions. For example, despite the late J. Edgar Hoover's annual report that crime was increasing continuously and rapidly, repeated scholarly reports reveal that crimes are proportionately fewer today by 50 to 200 percent than a century ago, p. 57. Consider these statements, "Jails ruin young men. ... No one in

the know doubts that jails must go," pp. 59-60. That rape is primarily a crime of aggression rather than sexual lust is a fact that may correct many a long-held opinion.

The book has great value for understanding the problems of modern society, which frequently become the pastor's problems in the congregation and the Christian's problems in his own family, but there must be a Cave, a word of warning, for the reader. Dr. Menninger identifies the basic problem of man as "egocentricity." Scripture agrees with that analysis, for when man sinned, his life ceased to revolve about his God and began to revolve about himself. But what is the corrective? Consider these statements: "The goal of all the great historic religions can be summarized as being the overcoming of one's self-love," p. 136. "Buddha, Confucius, Lao-tze, Socrates, Zeno, and all the Hebrew prophets from Amos to Jesus taught that sin, hate, alienation, aggression -- call it what you will -- could be conquered by love," p. 199. "The message that love can conquer hate can come from study and reflection, from counseling, from psychoanalysis, or from the pulpit," p. 203. Finally, Menninger quotes Arnold Toynbee with approval: "All the great historic philosophies and religions have been concerned, first and foremost, with the overcoming of egocentricity. At first sight, Buddhism and Christianity and Islam and Judaism may appear to be very different from each other. But, when you look beneath the surface, you will find that all of them are addressing themselves primarily to the individual human psyche or soul: they are trying to persuade it to overcome its own self-centeredness and they are offering it the means for achieving this. They all find the same remedy. They all teach that egocentricity can be conquered by love," p. 227.

Love is the solution to the problem of egocentricity or the problem of sin. True. All the world's religions advocate this solution. Also true. Does it, then, follow that there is no difference or only a difference in degree among all the world's religions? It would appear that Dr. Menninger, Mr. Toynbee, and, in general, all concerned scholars of human behavior and the civilization of mankind would say, "Yes." This would be the answer that could not but come forth from an evolutionary study of man, particularly a comparative study of

the origin of religions. This, of course, wipes out the distinction between man-evolved religions, on the one hand, and Christianity as the one God-revealed religion, on the other hand.

What is the difference? All man-made religions picture this healing love as self-stimulated, as springing up spontaneously in man or as induced into man by counseling, example, appeal to the intellect, emotions, and will. The love that is to heal the disease of egocentricity is a purely human love. As such, it can have and has had but limited success, as the history of mankind reveals. It can only heal the outward distresses of individuals and groups, and that but in an extremely limited way.

But this is not Christianity! When Christianity is pictured as offering self-generated love as the solution to man's self-love, then Christianity is perverted and, in fact, converted into paganism. Christianity does, indeed, proclaim love as the answer to the individual's and society's problems in time and for eternity. But that love is a transcendent love, the love of a God Who "so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son," Who "spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all." We love Him and can only love our neighbor because He first loved us. This is the good news of a love that has come from God to man in the Person of Jesus Christ. This is the love that alone has the power to regenerate egocentric man by creating in him the will to love both his God and his fellowman. Here is the cure for body and soul, for the individual and society, for time and eternity.

Dr. Menninger seeks to enlist the clergy in restoring moral concern and personal responsibility. This reviewer has believed and practiced for more than a quarter of a century, as has every gospel preacher, that the preaching of the gospel of God's love in Christ for man, who is drowning in self-love, is the best way to promote mental health, provide solutions for the problems of life, give strength to face the morrow whatever it may bring, create additional "salt" for the preservation of society, while at the same time, by the Spirit's power, creating a life in dying individuals that will never be extinguished.

The book is well worth reading, but its limitations must be recognized. After reading it one should appreciate more fully the healing treasure of the gospel that has been committed to us earthen vessels.

Paul F. Nolting

Educational Ideals in the Ancient World, by
William Barclay; Westminster Press, 1959;
Grand Rapids, Baker Book House, 1974 (Reprint).

"I hold that a proper education results, not in a laboriously acquired symmetry of phrases and language, but in a healthy condition of mind; I mean a mind that has understanding and true opinions about things good and evil, honourable and base." The above quotation from Julian the Apostate might well summarize the 'educational ideal' of each of the various cultures presented by William Barclay in his recently republished book entitled Educational Ideals in the Ancient World.

To the Jew "a mind that has understanding and true opinions" is the mind thoroughly grounded in Old Testament law. For the Athenian Greek, it was the mind of a "philosopher and a mind geared for action." The educational ideal of the ancient Roman was a mind "of self control, combined with dutiful affection to parents" and devotion for the state. In addition to the ideals of the Jew, Greek, and Roman, Mr. Barclay spends considerable time searching for the educational ideals of the early Christian culture.

The elaboration of these ideals, their source, and the method of inculcating them both in private and public systems of education -- all this and more is presented in Mr. Barclay's book. He covers much of the same ground that P. Marrou does in his Education in Antiquity. However, Barclay limits his work to the "ideals" in education of the ancient world.

The author is thoroughly acquainted with the subject matter. A look at the Bibliography he supplies indicates that he has read extensively in the area that he writes about. The abundance of quotations testifies to

his extensive research.

The book can be read rapidly and is worth the time and cost for the individual interested in the history and philosophy of education.

R. Gurgel

Bright Wind of the Spirit, by Steve Durasoff;
Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972;
cloth, 277 pages; \$6.95.

So much has been written on the subject of Pentecostalism, both in the secular and religious press, that the image of the movement has become unclear and confused. It may be difficult to see the forest for the trees. The book in hand, subtitled: "Pentecostalism Today," presents a clearly-written and concise discussion of the history and development of this religious movement.

The author, Dr. Steve Durasoff, has good credentials for writing such a book. Presently Associate Professor of Religious Education and Russian (an unusual combination of skills, perhaps!) at Oral Roberts University, Mr. Durasoff has also been the Crusade Co-ordinator for the Oral Roberts Evangelistic Association, and a pastor in Assemblies of God churches in New York and New Jersey. What this means is that the author is not writing "from outside looking in," so to speak, but as an insider in the movement.

The "history" portions of the book are the most interesting to this reader. The unwary are cautioned, of course, against an acceptance of Mr. Durasoff's account as truly historical, especially when he recounts "miracles" purportedly performed by Pentecostal preachers.

The book is recommended for the discerning, mature Christian layman and pastor. The warning is given that the author is writing to convince his readers of what he believes to be the "truth" of the Pentecostal movement. However, the book has value, also just for that reason: that the Christian pastor and others may become aware as to the real nature of the movement.

John Lau

C O N T E N T S

VOLUME 15

MARCH 1975

NUMBER 1

THE PRIVATE CARE OF SOULS (Conclusion)	1
A. Schulz	
THE GREEK ARTICLE AND THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST'S DEITY (Conclusion)	8
C. Kuehne	
FOUR WITNESSES FOR THE DEFENSE OF CHRIST'S DEITY	22
Paul Fleischer	
DEVOTIONS FROM THE BOOK OF JOB	29
C. M. Gullerud	
BOOK REVIEWS:	
<i>Whatever Became of Sin?</i>	34
Paul F. Nolting	
<i>Educational Ideals in the Ancient World</i>	39
R. Gurgel	
<i>Bright Wind of the Spirit</i>	40
John Lau	

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
Immanuel Lutheran College
Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701

Staff Contributors: A. Schulz, C. Kuehne,
D. Redlin, 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.
