



"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 17

SEPTEMBER 1977

NUMBER 3

ISSN 0361-1906

THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

VOLUME 17

SEPTEMBER 1977

NUMBER 3

CONTENTS

AN HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION TO LUTHER'S LARGE AND SMALL CATECHISMS	2
Robert Dommer	
NOTES ON THE HEBREW VERB	24
R. Wehrwein	
UPDATING ROMAN CATHOLICISM	36
A. Schulz	
ADDRESS AT SCHOOL OPENING AT ILC	46
C. M. Gullerud	

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

Subscriptions: \$4.00 per year, \$7.50 for 2 years, payable in advance.

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, P. Nolting,
C. Kuehne, R. Wehrwein.

Correspondence regarding subscriptions, renewals, and changes of address should be directed to the Managing Editor. Correspondence regarding material published in the JOURNAL should be addressed to the Editor-in-chief.

AN HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION TO
LUTHER'S LARGE AND SMALL CATECHISMS

WHAT LED LUTHER TO
WRITE THE CATECHISM

Martin Luther found it necessary to write the Catechism, not only because there was so little

knowledge of Christian doctrine among the people of his day — lay people and members of the clergy alike — but also because there was so little interest and concern in Scripture teaching. However, it had not always been this way. In the early Church there once had been a certain vitality and confessionalism, a living Christianity, that Luther wanted to recapture for the people of his day.

Even the idea of a catechism was not new. The real source for the Catechism was the confession that was required of catechumens and sponsors in the post-apostolic Church. These people lived in precarious times, times when ungodly Roman emperors freely tortured and killed Christians, times when a confessing Christian might easily not see another day or another week because of his confession, and yet times when the believer's faith and expressed confession was a source of joy and life. It was a time of vital Christianity. When someone at that time wished to become a member of the group, or wished to be baptized, a certain confession came to be required of the catechumen or sponsors, a confession which consisted of the Symbolum and Paternoster.¹ It was not until the 13th Century that this confession was expanded to include also the Ten Commandments. Thereupon it soon developed that in the Latin schools of the monasteries the Credo, Paternoster, Benedicite, Gratias, Ave Maria, Psalms, and other matters were taught, and this is likely where Luther also first became acquainted with them.

When printing came into being, numerous books of devotion were printed, containing, among other "trash,"² instructions on repentance. They contained

"Above all, however, a mirror of sins, intend-

ed as a guide for self-examination, on the basis of various lists of sins and catalogs of virtues, which, supplanting the Decalog, were to be memorized."³

These Luther evaluated in the *Smalcald Articles* this way, "Here, too, there was no faith nor Christ, and the virtue of the absolution was not declared to him, but upon his enumeration of sins and his self-abasement depended his consolation."⁴ Bente, in his historical introduction, gives a singular example of a Middle Ages prayer-booklet, listing in detail some of the contents: rosters and catalogs of sins, idolatrous adoration of saints and Mary, and silly superstitions connected with this.

"In order to be efficacious, a certain prayer prescribed in the *Hortulus* must be spoken not only with 'true contrition and pure confession,' but also 'before a figure which had appeared to St. Gregory.' Whoever offers a certain prayer 'before the image of Our Lady in the Son' 'will not depart this life unshriven, and thirty days before his death will see the very adorable Virgin Mary prepared to help him.' Another prayer is good 'for pestilence' when spoken 'before the image of St. Ann'; another prayer to St. Margaret profits 'every woman in travail'; still another preserves him who says it from 'a sudden death.' All of these promises, however, are far surpassed by the indulgences assured. The prayer before the apparition of St. Gregory obtains 24,600 years and 24 days of indulgence; another promises 'indulgence for as many days as our Lord Jesus Christ received wounds during His passion, viz., 5,475.' Whoever prays the Bridget-prayers not only obtains indulgence for himself, but 15 souls of his kin are thereby delivered from purgatory, 15 sinners converted, and 15 righteous 'confirmed and established in their good standing.'"⁵

Concerning these prayer-booklets, Luther wrote in his own booklet of 1522: "They are in sore need of a thorough and sound reformation, or to be eradicated entirely."⁶ Luther's education in the Latin schools of his day, a privilege which not many young people were

afforded, gave him the opportunity to learn the idolatrous prayer-books prescribed by the church, and when he ultimately came to faith, he had first-hand knowledge of those things that needed correction. A Catechism was needed to set the record straight and once more let the Scriptures speak clearly for the salvation of men; for although the prayer-booklets contained the Creed, Lord's Prayer, and the Decalog, they were not properly presented, but made to serve the Romish doctrine of work-righteousness. It is, therefore, easier to understand, then, the ignorance of the people and the clergy that Luther so bitterly spoke about in his introduction to the Small Catechism: "The common people, especially in the villages, have no knowledge whatever of Christian doctrine, and, alas, many pastors are altogether incapable and incompetent to teach."⁷ In his "Admonition to the Clergy" of 1530, Luther is quoted by Bente as writing: "Aye, there was in all the world no doctor who knew the entire Catechism, that is, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the Creed, to say nothing of understanding and teaching it."⁸ This gross ignorance of the rudiments of Christian teaching was impressed on Luther most vividly when he took part in the Electoral circuit toward the end of 1528 and in the beginning of 1529. At this point Luther knew that no time must be wasted in preparing and presenting a simple and yet comprehensive summary of the very basics of Christian truth.

OBJECT OF	Luther, aware that the future be-
LUTHER'S CONCERN	longs to the rising generation,
	made the instruction of the young

his chief concern. We read, accordingly, in Luther's Large Catechism (final paragraph):

"Let this, then, be said for exhortation, not only for those of us who are old and grown, but also for the young people, who ought to be brought up in the Christian doctrine and understanding. For thereby the Ten Commandments, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer might be the more easily inculcated upon our youth, so that they would receive them with pleasure and earnestness, and thus would practice them from their youth and accustom themselves to them. For the old are now well-nigh done for, so

that these and other things cannot be attained, unless we train the people who are to come after us and succeed us in our office and work, in order that they also may bring up their children successfully that the Word of God and the Christian Church may be preserved."⁹

Although Luther's chief concern was naturally the rising generation, we must remember that neither Catechism was written specifically for children. The Large Catechism was addressed specifically to "all Christians, but Especially to All Pastors and Preachers,"¹⁰ and the introduction of the Small Catechism, too, was similarly addressed. Luther felt that it was the pastors' responsibility to see to it that the Catechism was taught, and the parents' responsibility to come with their children to hear the preaching of the pastor. In 1525 the Wittenberg congregation passed a resolution which prescribed special sermons on the Catechism four times a year, and the regulation was followed. For example, on November 28, 1528, Luther exhorted from the pulpit:

"We have ordered, as hitherto has been customary with us, that the first principles and the fundamentals of Christian knowledge and life be preached four times each year, two weeks in each quarter, four days per week, at 10 A.M."¹¹

From this exhortation it is at once apparent whom Luther had in mind: those who could be in church at 10 A.M. on weekdays, namely the peasant-farmers that formed a good part of the Wittenberg congregation. That is why the Catechism-sermons of Luther were not academic; they were not written for theological colleagues or even students, but for the farm-folk and working people.

*"Diese Gemeinde besteht in der Hauptsache aus Kleinbürgern ... Wittenberg ist eine Landstadt trotz seiner Universität. Seine Einwohner sind fast alle Besitzer eines wenn auch bescheidenen Hauses, treiben Landwirtschaft, auch die Handwerker, haben Vieh., usw."*¹²

The fact that Luther had the parents in mind, and speci-

fically the father, can be seen from his Small Catechism, where every chief part except Confession (which was added later) is preceded by the words, "as the Head of the Family Should Teach Them in a Simple Way to His Household."¹³ There are many reasons Luther laid the responsibility for teaching the Catechism on parents: 1) because of the deplorable ignorance among parents (and preachers), they needed to learn the Catechism themselves for their own salvation; 2) they had time and opportunity, morning, noon, and evening (see superscription to Benedicite and Grantias), at the table and at devotions, to lead their children in prayer and Catechism teaching; 3) they had the greatest personal interest in this matter since their children were their own flesh and blood; 4) they were appointed of God to provide for the training of their children. Luther repeatedly speaks of "housefathers and housepriests, and house-teachers, performing the office of the ministry."¹⁴

*"Ihm (dem Hausvater) ist durch den kleinen Katechismus eine bleibende und in Notfällen Übertragbare Pflicht auf Herz und Gewissen gelegt."*¹⁵

Already in his sermons on the Ten Commandments in 1516 Luther admonished parents to bring up their children in the fear and admonition of the Lord, but added: "How has not all this been corrupted! Nor is it to be wondered at, since the parents themselves have not been trained and educated."¹⁶ In a sermon of 1526 Luther said:

"It plainly shows that they (parents) are altogether careless. Parents ought to see what their children and family are doing. ... We cannot enter the homes; parents, masters, and mistresses ought to be sufficiently skilled to require their children and servants to say the prayers before retiring. But they do not know any themselves. ... I admonish you master — for it is your duty — to instruct the servants, the mistress, the maids and the children; and it (the Word) is publicly preached in church for the purpose that it may be preached at home."¹⁷

In his sermon of September 14, 1528, Luther declar-

es that the Catechism is the Laymen's Bible. In a sermon of November 29, 1528, Luther exhorted parents to bring their children to the Catechism sermons:

"Think not, ye housefathers, that you are freed from the care of your household when you say, 'Oh, if they are unwilling to go, why should I force them? I am not in need of it.' You have been appointed their bishop and housepastor; beware lest you neglect your duty toward them! ... And this you are able to accomplish, that they pray in the morning and evening, before and after meals. In this way they would be brought up in the fear of God. ... Able teachers are necessary because of the great need, since parents do not concern themselves about this. But each master and mistress must remember that they are priests and priestesses over Hans and Gretchen."¹⁸

Note Luther's words, "Able teachers are necessary." Luther felt that teachers in the schools were very important for the spiritual training of the young, but he laid the basic responsibility with the *Hausvater*. When Luther speaks of children in his introductions to the Catechisms, he does not have in mind parochial school children in our present sense of the word, since there were not similar schools in his day. When, for example, Luther explains the Catechism in the Large Catechism as "*eine Kinderlehre*,"¹⁹ he does not have in mind specifically school children, but as he goes on to say, "*eine Kinderlehre so ein jeglicher Christ zur Not wissen soll!*"²⁰ When Luther speaks of children, he means the children and servants and young people of the household, and not school children at all.²¹ What Luther said in his sermon of November 29, he repeats in his Catechisms:

"Therefore it is the duty of every father of a family to question and examine his children and servants at least once a week and to ascertain what they know of it (the Catechism), or are learning, and, if they do not know it, to keep them faithfully at it. ... Likewise every head of a household is obliged to do the same with respect to his domestics, menservants and maidservants, and not to

keep them in his house if they do not know these things or are unwilling to learn them. For a person who is so rude and unruly as to be unwilling to learn these things is not to be tolerated; for in these three parts everything that we have in the Scriptures is comprehended in short, plain, and simple terms."²²

If a member of the household would ask the *Hausvater* for an explanation to a religious question, Luther wanted that *Hausvater* prepared to answer, and not to say: "*Mein Sohn, das weisz ich nicht. Das muszt du den Pfarrer fragen.*"²³

It is clear from what Luther has written and expected of parents that he had in mind the farm-folk of Wittenberg, where a *Hausvater* could be with his family at the table morning, noon, and night to lead the prayers, where he could be present to lead the morning and evening devotions, where he would have time and be present to examine his children weekly, where he would have control of his domestics, manservants and maidservants, where he could at the less busy seasons of the year take his family to weekday 10 A.M. service four days in a row.

That Luther had *Hausväter* in mind can also be seen from the content of the Catechism, specifically the Small Catechism. The Decalog was the Law given by Moses, but it was not written for a people but for the leaders of the households of Israel. Thus the Law reads not, "a people should," but directly and individually, "Thou shalt."

*"Ein Volk hat nicht Vater und Mutter. Ein Volk mordet nicht, bricht nicht die Ehe, macht den Mitisraeliten nicht zum Sklaven, erhebt nicht falsche Anklage gegen seinen Nächsten, ... Wohl aber sind die Hausväter die Repräsentanten des Volks, und von hier aus ist die Einleitung zum Dekalog zu verstehen. ... Der durch des 'Du sollst' Angesprochenen ist der Hausvater."*²⁴

This is also carried out in Luther's explanations, for

he does not write, "a person should fear and love God," or "God ought to be feared and loved," but directly says, "We should ...," implying the *Hausvater* and the whole family that is under his influence and control.

"Nicht: Wir Hausgenossen sollen Gott fürchten und lieben, dasz wir ..., sondern: Wir, nämlich, ich und mit mir die Hausmutter, und ihr, Söhne und Töchter, wir sollen ..."25

Or consider Luther's explanation of the Sixth Commandment. This has to do with the relationship between husband and wife, and with honoring and loving one's spouse, and its thrust is basically for those who are married. And yet Luther is careful for the sake of the whole family not to stress the negative aspects of the commandment, but to treat it positively in such a way that it can be taught to the whole household.

"Sonst heisst es immer zuerst: dasz wir nicht ... Hier heisst es nur: dasz wir. ... Luther ist es, der wenn wir einmal das Wort auf ihn anwenden wollen, Takt beweist, indem er nicht von den schmutzigen Dingen redet, die nicht geschehen sollen, sondern knapp und keusch von der Haltung spricht, die dem Christen ziemt."26

Moreover, all the editions of the Catechism during Luther's life contained in an appendix a manual on marriage, written not with children in mind at all, but that the *Hausvater* would rule well his own marriage and that of those within his household. In addition, the explanation of the First Article, "house and yard (farm), wife and child, land, cattle" (as well as the explanation of the 4th Petition), make clear that Luther was writing for farm folk in a situation where a *Hausvater* could be in control.

As a help to the *Hausväter*, particularly so that they, too, would know what to teach their children, Luther urged pastors to preach Catechism-sermons, to preach and teach from the pulpit the three parts in such a simple and clear form that the whole household would be edified. This was, in fact, one purpose for the Large Cat-

echism: to provide pastors a model for preaching on the Catechism. The advice, to preach on the Catechism, was given especially in connection with the *Deutsche Messe*, Luther's German Worship Service of 1526. According to that service, pastors were to preach the Catechism on Mondays and Tuesdays, and they were to explain and elaborate the text in a simple and meaningful way. Luther follows: "When the child begins to comprehend this, accustom it to carry home passages of Scripture from the sermons and to recite them to the parents at the table ..."²⁷

HOW TEACHING OF THE
CATECHISM WAS TO BE
ACCOMPLISHED

1) Popular and Simple — Luther urged that the *Hausväter* and preachers, too, would come down to the level of the children and prattle with them to bring Christian fundamentals home to the weakest and simplest.

"And let no one consider himself too wise and despise such child's play. When Christ desired to train men, He had to become a man. If we are to train children, we also must become children with them. Would to God that such a child's play were carried on well; then we should in a short time see a great wealth of Christian people."²⁸

2) Exact Memorizing — It was Luther's contention that exact memorization of the text (he says "word for word" in the Large Catechism) was important. He exhorted the *Hausvater* to teach the parts in such a way that not a syllable was changed upon repetition; he did not wish the children to repeat the Catechism one year differently from another. Luther insisted on this verbatim memorization not because he valued his own text so highly, for he urged the pastors, "Choose whatever form you please and adhere to it forever."²⁹ Rather, Luther insisted on verbatim memorization because he realized that without uniform texts and forms people and especially children can become easily confused, and then much labor and effort will be lost and the comprehension and effect of the teaching will be marred. How much was to be learned or how much at one time depended on the children, but Luther felt that even the least gifted could

memorize the three chief parts and the words of institution of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. That is why to Luther the Catechism was three parts, as he wrote in 1520:

"In the three chief parts everything is summed up with such brevity and simplicity that no one can complain or offer the excuse that it is too much or too hard for him to remember what he must know for his salvation."³⁰

3) Thorough Understanding — One of the present day objections to exact memorizing is that understanding is thereby not sufficiently stressed, and in certain instances this is possible. However, that was not Luther's intent. Luther wanted the exact text so thoroughly memorized that the learner would have a sure point of reference on which understanding could be based. Understanding was most important to Luther. He had seen enough of blind ritual and thoughtless and perfunctory recitation of prayers and rites to realize how worthless this was. That is one reason for formulating his explanation to the Small Catechism in questions and answers; that is why he repeatedly asked meaningful questions like, "Where is this written?" or "What does this mean?" or "How is this done?"; that is why he instructed *Hausväter* and pastors to formulate questions of their own to make the text meaningful. He would repeatedly have them ask their households, "What do you mean by ...?" It is because Luther was so concerned about understanding that he wrote a Large Catechism and insisted on Catechism-sermons, and indicated that it was the "duty of every father of a family to question and examine his children and servants at least once a week."³¹

4) Concrete Illustrations — Luther also recognized that a picture is worth a thousand words, and so in the interest of understanding he enriched his Catechism with pictures and urged the use of Bible-stories as illustrations. The woodcuts that Luther used often depicted scenes from Bible stories that illustrated the subject matter. Luther added the pictures "chiefly for the sake of the children and the simple folks who will remember the sacred stories more readily when you use pictures

and illustrations in teaching."³² Reu commented on this: "... thereby (with pictures) he exemplified that he adhered to the important pedagogical principle of intuition."³³ The earliest editions of the Catechism were printed on tables or charts that were hung on the walls of homes and churches, and proved just one more way to keep the Catechism and its explanation before the eyes of the people, for each of these charts not only contained one of the three chief parts, but the explanation as well.

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE CATECHISM

Luther seems to have begun preaching on the Catechism in a series of sermons on the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments from the end of June, 1516, to Easter, 1517. It seems that as a result of this work he was able to put into print an explanation of the Decalog, entitled: "The Ten Commandments Preached to the People of Wittenberg." On April 5, 1519, an explanation of the Lord's Prayer in German was also printed. It was taken up in south Germany and in Italy and appeared in many editions. The next major publication occurred in June, 1520, when Luther combined the two previous publications with a newly written explanation of the Creed. This manual was entitled: "The Short Form of the 10 Commandments, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer." It was in this booklet that Luther changed the traditional order (1. Creed, 2. Lord's Prayer, 3. Ten Commandments) to the order as we know it now. He explained his logic in this way:

"For in order to be saved, a man must know three things: First, he must know what he is to do and leave undone. Secondly, when he realizes that by his own strength he is unable to do it and leave it undone, he must know where he may take, seek, and find that which will enable him to do and to refrain. Thirdly, he must know how he may seek and obtain it. Even as a sick man needs first of all to know what disease he has, what he may or may not do, or leave undone. Thereupon he needs to know where the medicine is which will help him, that he may do and leave undone like a healthy person. Fourthly, he must desire it, seek and get it, or

have it brought to him. In like manner the commandments teach a man to know his disease, that he may see and perceive what he can do and not do, leave and not leave, and thus perceive that he is a sinner and a wicked man. Thereupon the Creed holds before his eyes and teaches him where to find the medicine, the grace, which will help him become pious, that he may keep the commandments, and shows him God and His mercy as revealed and offered in Christ. Fifthly, the Lord's Prayer teaches him how to ask for, get and obtain it, namely, by proper, humble, and comforting prayer. These three things comprise the entire Scriptures."³⁴

In this publication Luther also abandoned the traditional division of the Creed into 12 unrelated parts, and chose instead to arrange this material around the work of the Holy Trinity: Creation, Redemption, and Sanctification. This Short Form of 1520 in effect became the backbone of the subsequent Catechisms. For though other parts were added, Luther always considered the first three parts as the Catechism *par excellence*. "Even in his later years, Luther speaks of the first three parts as the Catechism proper."³⁵

In 1522 the Short Form became part of Luther's prayerbook, a booklet that became very popular and went into many reprints. In 1525 Luther's sermons on Baptism, Confession, and the Lord's Supper were also received into this booklet, and in 1529 the entire Small Catechism. Another significant booklet that contributed to the writing of the Catechism arose from the custom of the pastor of the Wittenberg congregation to read the five parts to the people after the sermon. These parts were printed in a booklet, "Booklet for Laymen and Children, 1525." It presented for the first time, in addition to the three parts, a section on Baptism (without the command) and the Lord's Supper. These additions may very likely have been made as a result of Luther's confrontation with the Enthusiasts in 1524. The last principal source of the Catechisms, however, is very obviously the three series of Catechism-sermons that Luther delivered from May to December of 1528. Each series treats of the five parts. People who have studied these sermons tell us that Luth-

er must have had them before him either by copy or in his own manuscript when he penned the Catechisms, since the material is so similar. A possible pattern for the Small Catechism was the Catechism of the Bohemian Brethren, a Catechism which existed some sixty years before Luther wrote his, and which contained the chief parts of the ancient Church plus the doctrine of the Sacraments in question-answer form. It is interesting to note that the meaning of the word "Catechism" does not in itself imply a question-answer format.

"Catechism means elementary instruction in Christianity, conceived, first, as the act; then, as the material for instruction; then, as the contents of a book; and finally, as the book itself."³⁶

The Catechism of the Bohemian Brethren, then, may have inspired Luther to publish a small book of similar format; it, at least, very likely led him to add the section on the Lord's Supper, since the statements made by the Bohemian Brethren on the Lord's Supper were dubious, if not false, doctrine.

THE ACTUAL WRITING

Toward the end of 1528 Luther, moved by the deplorable conditions that he discovered in his visitation of the Churches, began his work on the Catechism (10 years after his first sermons on the Ten Commandments), and by May, 1529, both the Small and Large Catechisms were in print. It is a moot question which Catechism was written first; the Small Catechism appeared in three parts in table form already in January of 1529, and the five chief parts and prayers seem to have been completed by March. The earliest evidence of printing of the Small Catechism is May 15, 1529, and of the Large Catechism, April 23. While the Small Catechism preceded the Large Catechism in chart form, the reverse is true regarding book form. Essentially, both were written at the same time. We may also conclude, both from the content of the Catechism and from Luther's words regarding them, that both Catechisms were meant for all, the Large giving further and more detailed explanation in sermon form to that which is so simply stated in the Small Catechism in question-answer form. Specifically, the Large Catechism was intended to give

sermon material for the less educated pastors in the villages; it was to teach them how to deliver plain, simple, and direct sermons on this matter. But the fact that it was also intended for *Hausväter* is apparent from Luther's instructions both at the beginning and at the end of the book.

While the Large Catechism presents very few textual problems either in itself or with subsequent editions, this is not true of the Small Catechism. There is some doubt as to the exact title of the book, though it is generally accepted as we have it, "Enchiridion, the Small Catechism."³⁷ Aside from the five chief parts, the first Catechisms contained the Preface, the Morning and Evening Prayers, the Table of Duties, and the Marriage Booklet. In the edition of 1531 Luther added a part before the Lord's Supper entitled, "How the Unlearned Should be Taught to Confess." He also increased the number of woodcuts to 23 and retained the booklets on Marriage and Baptism. In the edition of 1542 the promise to the 4th Commandment appeared for the first time, and the Table of Duties was expanded. This was essentially the last edition to appear during Luther's lifetime. The three questions on the Office of the Keys came into the Catechism through the Nuernberg Catechism of 1531 and gradually found a place in the fifth chief part; however, since they were not penned by Luther, they do not occur in the Book of Concord of 1580. The Christian Questions were added in 1549, and after 1558 they were found in most editions. The introduction to the Ten Commandments, "I, the Lord, Thy God," and the Doxology at the close of the Lord's Prayer were added after Luther's death. It is very probable that the two paragraphs, "What the Hearers Owe to Their Pastors," and "What Subjects Owe to Their Government," in the Table of Duties were not written by Luther, and they do not occur in the German Book of Concord.³⁸

A note is in order regarding the symbolical authority of the Catechisms. Luther never intended his Catechisms to be a textbook of dogmatics, or even a personal confessional statement. He surely never intended them to be a complete doctrinal statement. This is apparent from his introductory word, "*einfältiglich*,"³⁹ which im-

plies that Luther did not write everything that he wanted to say on the subject or that could be said, but only that which is most necessary and important to serve the purpose of instructing the *Hausväter* in the village. That the Catechisms have the character of a confession is true, but the fact that they are included in the symbols of the Church is something that happened on their own authority. There were no synodical resolutions or proposals by doctrinal committees. They were adopted, as the Thorough Declaration states, because

"They have been unanimously approved and received by all churches adhering to the Augsburg Confession, and have been publicly used in churches, schools, and homes, and moreover, because the Christian doctrine from God's Word is comprised in them in the most correct and simple way, and, in like manner, is explained, as far as necessary for simple laymen."⁴⁰

WHAT LUTHER ACHIEVED
WITH HIS CATECHISMS

1) He brought about a general revival of instruction in the Catechism by a direct appeal

to parents and children to become themselves familiar with the Decalog, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer.

2) He gave logical order to the parts of the Catechism by placing the Law first, and by eliminating the twelve unrelated sections into which the Creed was broken up in the Middle Ages by arranging them around the three great works — Creation, Redemption, and Sanctification.

3) He abolished all but two of the seven Sacraments of the Catholic Church with the addition of the sections on Lord's Supper and Baptism.

4) In a positive, non-polemical way Luther stressed "the beauty of personal faith, the supremacy of Christ and of His Word."⁴¹ At a time when Luther was contending with the Enthusiasts, with Zwingli, with the Anabaptists, to say nothing of popes and bishops, one might easily expect a fierce and strong defence of the truth. Instead, Luther, with special care, gave expression to Biblical

truth in a direct, warm, and personal manner that literally breathes the spirit of the Gospel.

5) Luther eliminated, most importantly, "the Romish interpretation and adulteration in the interest of work-righteousness"⁴² and restored the ancient forms with their evangelical quality. Thus throughout the Commandments we hear repeated, "fear, love, and trust," where giving all glory to God out of a spirit of love replaces that type of piety where work, obedience, performance added up to a sufficiency of merit. As Luther explained in one of his lectures on Deuteronomy,

"Faith in the words and promises of God is everything; for this reason we have said in the Catechism that true worship consists in the fear and love of God. This is commanded in the first precept, from which all others flow. The words of the Second Table, such as refraining from adultery, murder, theft, cannot be performed without faith. Without the First Commandment all others are nothing. If you obey the First, in other words, if you trust in Christ, you are justified; yet no one keeps this commandment except through the Holy Spirit, who draws us unto the Gospel."⁴³

If Luther's treatment of the Commandments is evangelical, his treatment of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer is permeated with the spirit of the Gospel.

6) Luther explained the basic Christian doctrine from God's Word in a "most correct and simple way" (to borrow words from the Thorough Declaration⁴⁴) as far as was necessary for simple laymen. He avoided lengthy analysis and abstract and detailed instruction, and instead presented so briefly and clearly what is necessary for salvation, that no one in the household could rightly complain that he was not able to learn it.

LUTHER'S CATECHISM TODAY

Our study of the historical introduction to Luther's Catechisms will have little meaning for us if by it we do not learn to see Luther's original intent and purpose in writing these books. Karl Bornhäuser describes

how it was:

*"Wir vergegenwärtigen uns noch einmal das Bild, das uns des Bfteren dienen muszte. Ort der Handlung: Der Bauergarten bzw. die Bauerstube. Gegenwärtig: Die Hausgemeinde. Handelnde: Der Hausvater und das junge Volk. Zuhörer: Die Übrigen, die Hausmutter, die Alten und die Kinder. Handlung: Das junge Volk fragt den Hausvater. Der Hausvater antwortet. Gegenstand des Gesprächs: Der Katechismus = die fünf Hauptstücke. Gemeinsame Voraussetzung: Gedächtnismässige Kenntnis ihres Wortlautes, ihres 'Textes' (gewonnen durch die Sitte der Hausandacht und des Tischgebets). Charakter des Gesprächs: Von seiten des Jungvolks Bitte um Kunde vom Glauben des Vaters, der Väter (Glaube hier nicht nur auf das Glaubensbekenntnis bezogen). Von seiten des Vaters: Bekenntnis zu ihm, nicht Auseinandersetzung über ihn, nicht 'Unterricht' über ihn, sondern Verkündigung in Ausübung des Hausvateramtes als eines Bischofsamtes."*⁴⁵

The same author describes a German household 45 years ago:

*"Das (einzige) Kind betet; die Mutter betet das Kind an, und der Vater liest die Zeitung."*⁴⁶

Is it possible that we might complain today as Luther did some 450 years ago: *"Hilf, lieber Gott! Wie manchen Jammer habe ich gesehen, dasz der gemeine Mann doch so gar nichts weisz von der christlichen Lehre"*?⁴⁷ Is it true in our midst that, in spite of confirmation instruction, many members no longer remember any of the five chief parts, to say nothing of understanding what they mean? Does it happen among us that because so little memorizing is required of children at home, not even the chief parts and their explanations (which Luther considered a bare minimum) can be required? How can we apply Luther's Catechism for the peasant farm household of 1529 to the modern American family of 1977? Certainly not by arguing that, since people today do not seem to fit the situation for which Luther wrote, the Catechism is obsolete. That would be throwing the child out

with the bath water. Essentials have not changed! Parents today are still in the eyes of God His priests and priestesses; they still have the responsibility to perform their God-given office in the home; they are still responsible and accountable for learning and knowing the Catechism truths themselves; it is their calling to let the Catechism live as a testimony of their own faith and as an announcement of the love of God toward their children; it is their privilege to lead their children in prayer and devotion and in meaningful memorizing and understanding of the precious and basic truths of salvation. There is no doubt whatever that the home is the most important and most effective place for such education.

But, alas, what has happened to the home? What has happened to the concept of *Hausvater*? Not only do we find an alarming number of homes where the father no longer is *Hausvater*, where he no longer makes decisions and guides and controls the family; we find that he has freely delegated Christian instruction of the young to his wife, and many times does not even lead the kind of life himself that would be a good confession to his family. Add to this the growing rate of fatherless homes, and we begin to ask, "What is the answer?"

The answer is clear! We need to take another look at our Catechism, not merely as a booklet for the children in confirmation class, but as a handbook of beautiful, direct Christian doctrine for fathers and mothers, as a handbook that relates to the complete life of the household from morning to night, as a handbook that shows the need and the blessing of a daily family life that is structured by the Word of God.

But we must be careful, too, that we do not overburden children and adults with explanations to the Enchiridion, and in the end lose the truth and spirit of the Catechism Luther wrote. The explanations of Gausewitz or Schwann, or your own, if you will, are valuable if they serve to make Luther's text live in the hearts and minds and lives of those who learn it; but we dare not become so involved with an explanation of an explanation, with memory and Bible resources beyond the capa-

bilities of the learner, that the intent of the Catechism as a brief, simple, clear, non-polemical exposition of the basic truths of Christianity is lost.

Catechism-teaching is important for our youth; we need to use our Christian schools as a precious aid in the teaching and learning of it, and our teachers need ever to remember that memory and Bible facts are not enough. Of all subjects, the understanding of the Catechism is most important as it relates to their personal faith and lives.

Catechism-teaching, however, is also important for our adults. We may need to preach and hear Catechism-sermons; we might well use Catechism wall-charts in our homes and Catechism banners in our churches; and if the situation is as bad as we feel it is, it might be well to begin where Luther began, with the three chief parts. Fundamentals are so important. We might insist, as Luther insisted, on exact memorizing of the basic text, coupled with a meaningful understanding and life. And if this means that a father or a mother call to mind a Catechism they once learned, this ought to be done. And if this means (and this is true of many adults today) that a father or mother for the first time learn to know and understand the Catechism, this is not too difficult an undertaking, for this is precisely why Luther wrote the booklet as a Small Catechism and not as a dogmatics textbook, so that the unlearned and children might grasp the essentials of salvation, and let it shine forth in their lives. It may not be possible in our age anymore to restore the concept of *Hausvater*, but the odds that are against us are not much greater than the odds that were against Luther, and we have one advantage. We have a tool that works. We have at our disposal the Catechism of Luther, written for the precise purpose of achieving the goals that we are after.

And for all of us, from the unlearned to the most wise, a continual study of the Catechism will always be rewarding, both in the strengthening of our personal faith, and in its influence on our lives.

"WE SHALL NEVER FINISH LEARNING IT, SINCE IT DOES

NOT CONSIST IN SPEECH, BUT IN LIFE ..."⁴⁸

Robert Dommer

FOOTNOTES

1. G. H. Gerberding, *The Lutheran Catechist* (Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society), pp. 54-66.
2. F. Bente, "Historical Introduction to the Lutheran Confessions," *Concordia Triglotta* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House), p. 65:
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Ibid.*, p. 67.
6. *Ibid.*
7. *Ibid.*, p. 533.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 68.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 773.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 567.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 69.
12. K. Bornhäuser, *Der Ursinn des Kleinen Katechismus Dr. Martin Luthers* (Glücksloh, Bertelsmann), p. 4.
 "This congregation consists principally of humble citizens. ... Wittenberg is a farm town in spite of its university. Almost all its inhabitants own their own homes, no matter how humble; they carry on farming; even the trades people have cattle, etc."
13. *Triglotta*, pp. 539-559.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 70.
15. Bornhäuser, *op. cit.*, p. 10. "A continuing obligation (for the training of their children) is laid on the heart and conscience of the housefather through the Small Catechism, and this obligation is to be given to another only in the direst circumstances."
16. *Triglotta*, p. 70.
17. *Ibid.*
18. *Ibid.*
19. *Ibid.*, p. 575. *Kinderlehre* = teaching for children.
20. *Ibid.* "... an instruction for children that every Christian must needs know."
21. Bornhäuser, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
22. *Triglotta*, p. 71.
23. Bornhäuser, *op. cit.*, p. 22. "My son, I do not know

- that. You will have to ask the pastor!"
24. *Ibid.*, p. 12. "A nation has no father or mother. A nation does not murder, does not commit adultery, does not make fellow-Israelites slaves, does not bear false witness against its neighbor. The housefathers are truly the representatives of the nation, and in this way is the introduction to the Decalog to be understood. The one addressed by 'Thou shalt' is the housefather."
25. *Ibid.*, p. 45. "Not: our household ought to fear and love God that we ...; but: we, that is, I, and with me mother, and you, sons and daughters, we should ..."
26. *Ibid.*, p. 63. "All the other commandments begin, 'We should fear and love God that we do not...' This commandment begins, 'We should fear and love God that we...' Luther here shows tact, if we may apply that word to him, by not dwelling on the unseemly things that should not take place, but in a concise and modest way speaks of the conduct befitting a Christian."
27. *Triglotta*, p. 70
28. *Ibid.*, p. 72.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 73.
30. *Ibid.*
31. *Ibid.*
32. M. Reu, *Catechetics* (Chicago: Wartburg Publishing House), p. 97.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 114.
34. *Triglotta*, p. 64.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 63.
36. *Ibid.*
37. Enchiridion = A book that can easily be carried in the hand, used first by Augustine to describe one of his works that "could easily be carried in the hand, or rather, ought continually to be so carried, since it contained the things most necessary for salvation." *Triglotta*, p. 65.
38. *Triglotta*, p. 560.
39. *Einfältiglich* = "in all simplicity."
40. *Ibid.*, p. 90.
41. T. Graebner, *The Story of the Catechism* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House), p. 77.
42. *Triglotta*, p. 64.
43. Graebner, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

44. *Triglotta*, p. 90.
45. Bornhäuser, *op. cit.*, p. 159. "We again look at the scene to which we have repeatedly given attention: The Setting: The garden, respectively, a room in the peasant home. Present: The household as a congregation. Principals: The father of the family and the young people. Listening in: The others — mother, the aged, and the children. The Action: The young people present their questions to the father of the family. The father answers. Subject of Discussion: The Catechism — five chief parts. Generally supposed or taken for granted: Knowledge of the outward words and 'text' of the Catechism — learned by rote (acquired in the course of customary family devotion and prayer.) Nature of the Discussion: On the part of the young people, inquiry into the faith of the father, the fathers. (Faith here not merely a confession of faith.) On the part of the father, a profession of his faith, not a detailed analysis of these truths or a lecturing about them, but a proclamation, thus fulfilling his office as a father and as a bishop."
46. *Ibid.*, p. 126. "The (only) child is praying; the mother is worshipfully watching, and the father, all the while, is reading the newspaper."
47. *Triglotta*, p. 532. "Help, good God! What a pitiful situation I saw! The common people know absolutely nothing of Christian teaching."
48. Luther's Catechism—sermon of November 27, 1530.



NOTES ON THE HEBREW VERB

We proceed now to examine what various writers have to say about J. Wash Watts' book on Hebrew syntax.

1. The first review we consider is one by E. J. Young in the *Westminster Theological Journal*, May, 1965, pp. 164-166. Surely nothing would be more welcome to us than a penetrating review of Watts' book from the pen of this pre-eminent Old Testament scholar and student of Hebrew. Unfortunately, we find nothing of the kind. Watts' book is casually reviewed alongside an elementary instruction book in Arabic by Farhat J. Ziadeh. Most of the space is devoted to Ziadeh's book and to the importance of understanding Arabic in order to clear up problems in the Old Testament. Young's direct statements about Watts' grammar (he is reviewing the 1964 edition) are few, and though "non-committal" might be too strong a term for them, Young is certainly careful enough not to sin in the other direction. "Dr. Watts has written a practical and useful study of the syntax of Old Testament Hebrew. ... This is not a book merely for the specialist, although the specialist can derive much profit from it, but it is also admirably adapted for use by the clergyman who may wish to preach from the Old Testament and yet who is not thoroughly familiar with the Hebrew. Such a clergyman should use this book as he would a commentary, for the work casts much light on many passages. At times one may not agree with every statement made, but it cannot be denied that here is much worthwhile material."

What excites Young's interest the most is the reference by Watts to Kapliwatsky's Arabic grammar on p. 66, and that is what promptly launches Young into his discussion of Arabic and his review of Ziadeh's book. Reference is made by Watts to Kapliwatsky's grammar in order to support his own assertion on p. 65: "Insistence upon a distinctive meaning for any imperfect in past time [in Hebrew] is strongly supported by the use of imperfects in Arabic." Young expresses hearty approval of this use of the Arabic to shed light on Hebrew syntax, and also refers to Kapliwatsky's grammar as "a splendid instruction book in Arabic."

2. Our second review is by Donald M.C. Englert; it appears in the winter, 1964, issue of *Theology and Life* pp. 334-335. This review is also brief. Englert states the simple fact that "the author is suggesting that many of the time-honored and familiar translations of well-known passages need to be corrected, in light of distinctive (the author's own word) translations of perfect and imperfect Hebrew verbs, which he would make." After reporting a couple of Watts' distinctive translations, he then says: "Although one can discern, in isolated instances, traces of the author's particular theological stance, one is able to voice his gratitude for this particular work, a handy index of perplexing problems and attempts to solve them for the advanced student of Hebrew." As a serious evaluation of Watts' work, that doesn't leave us with much. As an indication of the reviewer's predicament, it suggests quite a bit: he and others do not know what to think themselves, and are not sure enough of their ground to offer anything but such cautious statements.

3. Raymond Surburg reviews the book in the summer, 1964, issue of *The Springfielder*, pp. 39-40.¹ This review also is noncommittal, but a couple interesting points are raised in the last paragraph, which we quote in its entirety:

"The reviewer has been puzzled by the fact that Carl Brockelmann in his *Hebräische Syntax* (1956) does not list in his lengthy bibliography Dr. Watt's (sic) work nor does he anywhere take cognizance of the revolutionary character of Watt's position. On the other hand, Dr. Watts ignores the *Hebräische Syntax* of Brockelmann, one of the outstanding Orientalists and Semitic scholars that Germany has produced in the twentieth century. If Dr. Watts is correct then the translators of the Septuagint, Jerome in the Vulgate, as well as rabbinical scholarship throughout the ages have been blissfully ignorant of the proper way to translate the writings of the Old Testament. Two translations of the Old Testament, one by a group of conservative Protestant scholars (*The Berkeley Version in Modern English*), the other by modern critical Jewish scholars (*The*

Torah. The Five Books of Moses. A New Translation of the Holy Scriptures according to the Traditional Hebrew Text), which have appeared since 1951 do not seem to have been persuaded by the arguments of Dr. Watts and have continued to follow more or less the traditional interpretation of the perfect and imperfect with *waw* consecutive."

We are once again met with unfulfilled expectations. Surburg calls our attention to the book and to the fact that the position of Watts is revolutionary. But we still look in vain for substantive evaluation. We are only led to suspect that even the eminent scholars perhaps do not always do quite as much homework as they should (or at least not as much as we would like them to do, or not the kind we would like them to do!). We find that there are others on the same merry-go-round on which we find ourselves -- eagerly seeking pertinent comments and evaluations from other scholars on the problems that trouble us.

4. An excellent review by L.H. Brockington appeared in the January, 1952, issue of *The Baptist Quarterly*, pp. 236-237. Not only does this review give a brief and accurate summary of the essentials of Watts' theory, but it also addresses itself to the very significant absence in Watts of philological discussion. "The avoidance of philological discussion, which lends to it a useful brevity and directness, is the trait by which the book will either stand or fall. If the treatment is self-convincing and stands the test of proof in translation, then the details of philological justification can be left aside, but otherwise the arguments require to be built up on a firm foundation based on a study of origins. In any case, the result is one which will invite Hebrew scholars to look once again at their ideas of the Hebrew Tenses. Dr. Watts treats Hebrew as an isolated language without cognates and without parentage." "One feels that the author should have given more space to a defence of his rejection of the current theories about the *waw* consecutive idiom which are based on the mixed parentage of the Hebrew language ..." We are at the crossroads again. Which shall have priority: logical analysis, or historical, philological considerations?

Brockington also expresses himself on another point of central significance: "Apart from philological considerations, it seems to the reviewer that it would have been simpler to have accepted the imperfect with *waw* consecutive just as we find it, that is, as a past tense in continuous narrative, and to translate accordingly. That would at least satisfy the desire to treat the form according to its usage."

Other questions are also raised. "Why, we may ask, is it that 'only perfects can be correlated by *waw* conjunctive'" (p. 97). On the same page we read that 'all verbs except perfects can be co-ordinated by it' and we wonder why the perfect is so confidently set aside in this way. Moreover, we have already read (on p. 85) that 'The relation between the perfects linked by it (the *waw* conjunctive) may be co-ordinate, correlative or collateral.'"2

The review is concluded with these statements: "Recognition of a *waw* consecutive idiom with both tenses is so widespread, and belief that it may have its origin in the mixed parentage of Hebrew so strong, that a very convincing alternative theory will be required to take its place. The book requires a philological supplement in which the claims made can be related to what is known of the origin and history of the tenses." The more one studies this review, the more one is impressed. Mr. Brockington has done an immense service by his clear and penetrating statements.

5. A review by J.C.L. Gibson appeared in the March, 1967, issue of the *Scottish Journal of Theology*, pp. 108-109. Reviews come in all stripes. This one, even taking into account certain mitigating statements, is unabashedly and devastatingly critical. Gibson grants that Watts knows his Old Testament "like the back of his hand," and that interpretations of individual passages "are often attractive and percipient"; he even says that he believes Watts "has a keen insight into the Hebrew mind," and suggests that Watts may be doing a service in casting doubts on the explanations of scholars who have become household names. But Gibson begins the review in sarcasm, goes on to refer to the book as "hopelessly muddle-headed for all

that, a phantasmagoria of speculation and impression quite detached from scientific language study," expresses the fear that the student going on to study Watts after studying Davidson will only have "his erroneous conception of Hebrew" compounded, and flatly states near the end of the review: "As a professional linguist, I found it [the book] most distressing." The prime mistake, according to Gibson, of many students of Hebrew, whether theologians or linguists, is "arguing from meaning to form, i.e. you have a meaning which is expressed by a form, whereas what you really have is a form which may have one or two or more different meanings." And our less than kindly reviewer makes no attempt to conceal his anger. "But to pretend that he [Watts] came to this and his other conclusions from an unbiased examination of Hebrew syntax is nonsense." "This book is a prime example of what happens when a theologian with no real interest in language for its own sake -- however long he has studied a language -- puts his thoughts into print. Language -- Hebrew or Greek -- may be a handmaid of theology, but it is not a tool to be manipulated by theologians."

6. Finally, we have A.R. Crabtree's article in the Oct., 1951, issue of *The Review and Expositor*, entitled: "A Survey of Syntax in the Hebrew O. T. by Dr. J. Wash Watts, An Appreciation." Not only are reviews of all stripes, they are also of all sizes, this one being an essay-length review from pp. 442-452, an article which it would be well for our readers to acquire and study.

Crabtree first commends Watts for his clarification of the exact meaning of Hebrew verb forms, claiming that his aspectual treatment is even more consistent and thorough-going than that of authors such as Harper and S.R. Driver. Crabtree is in hearty agreement with this aspectual treatment, and states: "In an article published in *The Review and Expositor* for January, 1946, I presented practically the same explanation of the so called Hebrew tenses." (p. 444) One gathers from the rest of the article that he is in agreement with Watts' treatment of the *waw* consecutive with the imperfect. No specific comments are made on the fundamental distinction between the significance of the two forms of *waw* posited

by Watts: strong *waw* indicates a sequence, weak *waw* indicates a parallel. It is Watts' treatment of the perfect-*waw* combination to which the largest portion of this article is devoted. And while our reviewer by no means rejects Watts' correlative perfect,³ he does reject Watts' rejection of the consecutive perfect. "With keen appreciation of his scholarship and his insight into the Hebrew Scriptures, I am not able to agree with him in dispensing with the perfect consecutive." (pp. 444-445) He grants, however, that this difference of opinion would not make much difference in translation.

Crabtree (p. 445) gives four reasons why he cannot dispense with the perfect consecutive. 1) The perfect consecutive construction in no way contradicts the nature of the perfect as indicating completed action. 2) The imperfect consecutive construction logically implies the perfect consecutive construction. (This reminds us of the earlier aspect theorists, such as S.R. Driver, who said that the consecutive imperfect called forth the corresponding consecutive perfect.) 3) As there are two uses of *waw* with the imperfect, so there may be also with the perfect, even if the distinction cannot be found in the vocalization of the *waw*. 4) Watts' arguments against the perfect consecutive, though deserving of our careful consideration, are not decisive or conclusive.

This challenges us with the formidable task of drawing a clear line of distinction between correlative and consecutive perfects, if indeed both exist. While Crabtree cites Genesis 29:2b-3, I Sam. 2:19, and Isaiah 6:1-2 as "*bona fide*" examples of consecutive perfects, Watts would necessarily class them as correlative perfects, by virtue of his rule that any perfect attached to *waw* is a correlative perfect. What, precisely, are the criteria, if any, by which we may designate a verb as one or the other?⁴ Or is the consecutive perfect one kind of correlative perfect? Let's review the definition of "consecutive" as given by Gesenius-Kautzsch: "By *waw* consecutive an action is always represented as the direct, or at least temporal consequence of a preceding action."⁵ And Crabtree himself writes on p. 450: "These consecutive forms, both perfect and imperfect, are not substitutes for their respective antecedents. They are special forms,

designed to carry to a logical development the thought presented by their antecedents."

The examples cited above as examples of genuine consecutive perfects have this in common, that because of its connection with the preceding verb the perfect ends up being translated as an imperfect. In the one instance of I Sam. 2:19, appeal is made by Crabtree to the famous phrase of S.R. Driver: "Thus the perfect consecutive carries forward the action of the imperfect to 'a calm and settled conclusion'." (p. 446) But on the other hand, in treating Genesis 2:6, Watts writes: "Is it not indicated that the watering occurred frequently, even as the rising of the mist? Yes, it is so indicated, because the perfect with *waw* correlates watering with the frequent rising of the mist. Frequency is indicated by the imperfect, correlation by the perfect with *waw*." (p. 113)

This same Genesis 2:6 is selected by Crabtree, along with Genesis 24:7, to illustrate the difference between a correlative and a consecutive. And it is the perfect with *waw* in the former passage that Crabtree insists is a consecutive perfect, while the perfect with *waw* in the latter is a correlative perfect. For one thing, he points out that in Gen. 24:7, but not in Gen. 2:6, the imperfect and perfect with *waw* have different subjects. He comments further: "Now each time the mist went up it fulfilled its purpose and watered the earth. This construction is quite different from the one in Gen. 24:7. There the *waw* serves as a conjunction with the normal function of co-ordination or correlation. In Gen. 2:6, however, the *waw* subordinates the perfect to its antecedent, with one subject, and thus forms a different type of construction from the one in Gen. 24:7." (p. 448) So important does Crabtree regard this example, that he writes: "His [Watts'] explanation breaks down on Gen. 2:6, unless the word correlate is used with a different meaning from that which applies to the construction in Gen. 24:7."⁶ (p. 449)

So much for the reviews. The last three in particular can be helpful for us, as we each work toward our own evaluation of Watts' views on Hebrew syntax.⁷

Our approach in these notes has been chiefly historical: we have simply reported as best we can the views of a number of the principal writers on Hebrew syntax. Perhaps it would be helpful at this point to make a brief topical survey of the ground.

1. Do the verbs express state or time? In the last century a whole camp of grammarians, of whom the outstanding representative was S.R. Driver, opted for aspect. This theory, which represented at that time a complete remodelling of Hebrew syntax, really became the "traditional" theory. But Bauer, Blake, and (perhaps to a lesser degree) G.R. Driver, moved back toward favoring time, without, however, necessarily eliminating state. Taking Blake as representative, his arguments are that the aspect theory leaves much inadequately explained and leads to confusion, and that *a priori* it is unlikely that verbs in any language are used exclusively to express aspect.

2. What shall be determinative in our approach to seeking solutions to the problems of the Hebrew verbal system: logic, or philological development? To a considerable degree, the aspect theory has been associated with the former, the more recent partial return to emphasis upon time, at least in its beginnings, with the latter.⁸ Watts, perhaps the most consistent aspect theorist, makes but scant reference to anything outside the realm of Biblical Hebrew,⁹ though such considerations had been in the forefront for many years. To say that neither method or approach ought to be used dogmatically, to the exclusion of the other, and that both ought to be used with care, is perhaps only saying the obvious. Even so, if adopted, such a posture entails the putting of a question mark behind Watts.

3. Is the waw consecutive with imperfect construction still in some sense a true imperfect, or is it what it appears to be: a simple preterit? This question is intimately connected with the two foregoing questions. And one can argue either from the first two to this one, or from this one to the first two.¹⁰

4. Is there a fundamental distinction of meaning

between the two forms of waw? The hypothesis cautiously advanced by Blake in order to explain the rise and fall of both types of consecutive constructions in Hebrew, is that the strong waw indicated a past meaning, the weak waw an imperfect meaning. The position taken by Watts is that the strong waw indicates a sequence, the weak waw a parallel. Such a far-reaching distinction needs careful testing and examination before it is accepted. Unfortunately, even Crabtree, who wrote the longest of the reviews we have considered, did not comment on this. The traditional aspect theory distinguishes between the ordinary waw and the waw consecutive, whether with the imperfect or perfect, but both the strong and the weak waw may be consecutive; hence the two basic uses of the waw do not correspond to the two basic forms of waw.

5. How are we to categorize the uses of the perfect with waw? Ordinary perfects and consecutive perfects (using the accent shift as a rough guide)? That's the position of the majority. Correlative perfects only (Watts)? Correlatives and consecutives (Crabtree)?

All this most clearly brings home to us the necessity of steeping ourselves in the Hebrew, so as to develop a true feel for the language and a capacity to form independent judgments of the theories of the grammarians. What others are not doing satisfactorily for us, we are obliged to attempt to do ourselves. In all language study, there is no substitute for immersing oneself in the original.

R.E. Wehrwein

FOOTNOTES

1. It should be noted that on p. 40 of this review there is an inaccuracy in a quotation from p. 5 of Watts (2nd edition). In line 5 of Surburg's quotation, the 2nd last word, "perfect," should be "imperfect." A phrase is also omitted from the original at that point, and we should read: "... makes the imperfect to which it is attached to receive the force of a preceding

perfect ..."

2. A comment may be in order regarding the alleged discrepancy which Brockington appears to have found in certain statements Watts made regarding the perfect tense: i.e. that the perfect cannot be coordinated by the *waw* conjunctive (p. 97), and that the perfect may be linked by the *waw* conjunctive to another perfect in a co-ordinate relation, as well as in a correlative or a collateral relation (p. 85). The pertinent paragraph, on p. 85 of the 1951 edition, reads thus: "*Waw* conjunctive appears always to indicate a parallel. It is the only form of *waw* used with perfects. The relation between the perfects linked by it may be co-ordinate, correlative, or collateral. In all these cases the relation is parallel. ..." Watts must have meant that the relation between verbs (and not perfects) linked by the *waw* conjunctive may be coordinate, correlative, or collateral. That would be in harmony with his theory and would remove the discrepancy. The corresponding paragraph in the 1964 edition is reworded as follows: "*Waw* conjunctive appears always to indicate a parallel. It is the only form of *waw* used with correlative perfects, and this usage magnifies the parallel. With imperfects the relation may be co-ordinate or collateral, but it is still parallel. A subordinate reason clause is collateral. ..."

3. On p. 449 Crabtree writes: "Most of the examples of the perfect with *waw*, presented by the author to prove that they are correlated or co-ordinated perfects, are correctly explained, but these constructions are quite different from the perfect consecutive." As if we did not have enough trouble wrestling with some of this abstract terminology, we are here, to our dismay, confronted with another curve ball. Terms carefully distinguished by Watts ("Correlate" and "Coordinate") seem to be regarded by Crabtree as interchangeable. This is illustrated by another sentence on p. 448 of Crabtree's review: "There [in Gen. 24:7] the *waw* serves as a conjunction with the normal function of co-ordination or correlation." For what it's worth, the *American Heritage Dictionary* gives as the definition of "correlate": "To put or bring into causal, complementary, parallel, or reciprocal relation"; it says that to "coordinate" is

"to place in the same order, class, or rank."

4. It is true that we are partially guided by the accent shift as the sign of the consecutive perfect, but there are exceptions to this rule. Again, typically, we see two responses to the evidence: 1) the large number of exceptions necessitates a rejection of the rule entirely (Watts); 2) even the large number of exceptions need not overturn the general rule, for they are capable of explanation on other grounds (Crabtree).

5. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley, 2nd English edition, Oxford, p. 133 (footnote).

6. At this point, it doesn't take much effort for me to regard the verbs in both cases equally well as correlatives or consecutives, or for that matter as coordinates! (One cannot even safely exclude "collaterals," at least not in Gen. 2:6, for one of the dictionary definitions of "collateral" is: "of a secondary nature; subordinate," and Crabtree has just written that in Gen. 2:6 the *waw* subordinates the perfect to its antecedent! We take it that Crabtree is using "subordinate" in a rather loose sense.) Whether this is a temporary or a permanent impasse cannot, of course, be determined at this time. The temptation to concede oneself unequal to all this becomes at length quite strong.

7. We might add Watts' own comments after thirteen years. He writes in the preface to the 1964 edition (p. 5): "The original form of this work was published in 1951. In the thirteen years since that time no serious effort has been made to contradict its interpretation of the distinctive meanings in Hebrew verb forms and syntactical constructions. Some deficiencies have been pointed out by friendly critics; strong words of commendation have also been received."

8. We need to emphasize here the limited scope of this study. Only a few writers have been examined; the treatment is nowhere near exhaustive. Generalizations, therefore, must be made only with great care. Perhaps the number of those who rely upon philological development in the cognate languages and still retain the aspectual

point of view is now as great as or greater than the number whose employment of such philological considerations has led them away from a thorough-going aspect theory. Consider the following statements, taken from the introduction to *Hebrew Syntax, An Outline*, by Ronald J. Williams, University of Toronto Press, 1967: "Since classical Hebrew had early abandoned the tense concept in favour of an aspectual one, the use of 'aspect' in place of 'tense' is desirable. To describe the verbal form contained in the construction usually known as the 'waw-consecutive with the imperfect,' the word 'preterite' has been chosen to indicate its original tense signification as well as the fact that its origin was different from that of the imperfect, as is shown by the weak verbs and the *Hiphil* of strong verbs." (pp. 5-6)

9. We have already noted that Watts does refer to the use of the imperfect in Arabic as support for his treatment of the imperfect in Hebrew. In treating the use of the perfect in future time, Watts writes: "Moreover, when we take into account the fact that 'the other Semitic languages do not exhibit this peculiarity, excepting occasionally the Phoenician, the most closely related to Hebrew, and of course the Moabitish dialect of the *Mesa* inscription, which is practically identical with Old Hebrew,' we know that probably we must look to Biblical Hebrew alone for evidence bearing on an explanation." (p. 53) (The quotation in this quotation is from p. 132 of the Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley Hebrew grammar.) Finally, there are the very interesting statements on p. ix of the preface to the 1951 edition: "Last in point of time but by no means least in point of encouragement has been aid received from Professor G.R. Driver of Magdalen College, Oxford University, England. ... His treatment of the Accadian permansive state as the probable forerunner of the Hebrew perfect, as given in *Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System*, has served to strengthen opinions held by this author. ... Likewise, his suggestions concerning the origin of the Hebrew imperfect have strengthened these opinions, inasmuch as it is believed that those suggestions indicate no essential conflict between the origin of the imperfect and its usage in this text."

10. Our inclination is to give priority to the more

immediate and specific question of the nature of the *waw* consecutive with imperfect construction, and to permit the answer we obtain to shed light on our approach to the first two questions. We lean toward taking this construction at face value, as a preterit. That immediately opens the door to the use of historical, philological considerations to provide an explanation of the existence of this construction. G.R. Driver's succinct explanation (Wein-green, pp. 252-253) is plausible. Opting for the preterit nature of the *waw* consecutive with imperfect construction is not in itself, however, determinative of our stance on the first question of state or time, except insofar as the use of such historical, philological considerations would lead us in one direction or the other. It has not led everyone the same way.



U P D A T I N G R O M A N C A T H O L I C I S M

(Continued)

We can hardly make a study of the Roman Catholic Church without directing our attention to Mary, the mother of Jesus. Surely there are few people in literature that have had so many legends around them as Mary. The very simplicity of the Scriptural record is no doubt one reason for the abundance of legendary material, of which she forms the central figure. Imagination has been called in to satisfy a craving which authentic writings did not supply.

For purposes of our study, we shall divide her life into three parts:

I. The period of her childhood, up to the time of the birth of our Lord. The source of information here is only the early apocryphal gospels, thus legendary.

II. The period of her youth and middle age, contemporary with the Bible account.

III. The period following the Ascension of Christ. Here we have only the traditions and tales which originated outside of the Church, but after a time were transplanted within her boundaries and there flourished and increased. From time to time alleged visions and revelations have been added.

MARY'S CHILDHOOD According to legend, Mary's father was Joachim, who lived at Nazareth. Her mother was Anna, who first lived at Bethlehem. After 20 years of marriage, Joachim supposedly went to Jerusalem for the Feast of Dedication. There he was scorned by the high priest Issachar and was driven away, because he had no children. Shamed, Joachim retired into the wilderness and fasted for 40 days and 40 nights. Then an angel is said to have appeared to him, telling him that his wife would conceive and bring forth a daughter, and that he should call her name Mary. Meanwhile, Anna was much distressed by her husband's absence. Sadly she went for a walk in her garden, dressed in her wedding dress. She prayed that she might have a child, even as Sarai was blessed with Isaac. Now two angels appeared to her and promised that she would have a child who would be spoken of in all the world. In due time, Anna gave birth to a daughter, and they named her Mary. When Mary was nine months old, she walked nine steps. When she was three years old, her parents brought her to the temple to dedicate her to the Lord. She remained at the temple until she was twelve years old, being much loved by all of Israel.

Then the high priest commanded all the virgins in the temple to return to their homes and to be married. Mary refused, saying that she had vowed virginity to the Lord. A voice from the ark of the covenant then spoke, commanding that all the widowers and marriageable men in Israel should be gathered together, each bringing a rod. Among them was Joseph, who was now an old man and had children. When Joseph presented his rod, a dove came forth from it and flew upon his head. Reluctantly, Joseph was compelled to betroth himself to Mary. He then returned to Bethlehem to prepare for his marriage. Mary went back to her parents' home in Galilee.

One day when she went out to fetch a pitcher of water, the angel Gabriel greeted her with the words in Luke 1:28-38. Before long, Joseph came to marry her and found that she was with child. In a dream he was told to take her into his home. After some time they went to Bethlehem to be taxed (Luke 2). As Joseph was seeking a midwife, he looked up and saw that the birds had stopped in their flight, the sheep stood still, the goats touched the water with their mouths but did not drink, etc. When he brought the midwife to the cave, a bright cloud covered the cave. It became a bright light. When the light faded, there appeared an infant at Mary's breast. The midwife went out and told Salome that a virgin had given birth, but Salome would not believe. They went back into the cave, and Salome received satisfaction. But her hand withered away and was not restored until, by the command of an angel, she touched the child, whereupon she was immediately cured. — This, then, is a brief summary of the legends surrounding the early life of Mary.

MARY'S YOUTH AND MIDDLE YEARS

We now pass, with some relief, from legend to that period of Mary's life which is made known to us in Holy Scripture. In the genealogy of Matthew 1:16, Joseph's father is referred to as Jacob. In the genealogy of Luke 3:23, we read of Jesus being "the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli." This seeming difficulty is easily solved by noting that twice in Luke's genealogy the word "son" is used in the sense of "son-in-law."¹

While living in Nazareth, probably at her parents' home, while Mary was betrothed to Joseph, the angel Gabriel came to her with a message from God. She was to be the mother of the long-awaited Messiah. Gabriel probably bore the form of an ordinary man, for we are told that he "came in," εἰσελθὼν (Luke 1:28). We note that she was troubled, not at his presence, but at the meaning of his words. The exact meaning of κεχαριτωμένη is "you who have received a free gift of grace." Our King James version translates very correctly: "highly favored." This is much closer to the original than the Vulgate translation, "*gratia plena*," which the Catholic

Bible translates as "full of grace." We immediately recognize that a huge and wholly unsubstantiated edifice has been built on this by Catholic devotional writers. The next part of the salutation, "The Lord is with thee," might just as well be understood as "The Lord be with thee." In any case, this is the same greeting with which the angel accosted Gideon in Judges 6:12. The words, "Blessed art thou among women," are not found in the oldest Greek manuscripts, and so are found only in the footnote of Nestle's Greek New Testament.

After the angel left, Mary set off to visit Elizabeth. Immediately upon Mary's entering the house, Elizabeth saluted her as the mother of her Lord. Mary embodied her feelings of exultation and thankfulness in the hymn known as the Magnificat. This hymn is founded on Hannah's song of thankfulness (I Samuel 2:1-10). It exhibits an intimate knowledge of the Old Testament writings. The most remarkable clause, "From henceforth all generations shall call me blessed," is borrowed from Leah's exclamation at the birth of Asher (Genesis 30:13). The same expression is found also in Proverbs 31:28, Malachi 3:12, and James 5:11. In this last passage, the word $\mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ is well rendered "count happy." So the idea that the word somehow conveys the suggestion that Mary will bear the title "Blessed" arises solely from ignorance.

From here on, there is no need to go into great detail. The visit of the shepherds, the circumcision, the adoration of the wise men, and the presentation in the temple are scenes in the life of Christ rather than in that of His mother. The song of Simeon and the thanksgiving of Anna refer only incidentally to Mary. After the return from their flight into Egypt, we picture Mary as living in Nazareth, pondering over the sayings of the angels, the shepherds, Simeon, and of her Son, as He "increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man," (Luke 2:52). We hear of her again when her 12-year-old Son remained behind in Jerusalem.

After Jesus began His ministry, we read of Mary on only four occasions: 1) at the wedding in Cana of Galilee (John 2:1-11); 2) the attempt which she and His

brethren made "to speak with Him," (Matthew 12:46, Mark 3:31, Luke 8:19); 3) the crucifixion; and 4) the days after Christ's Ascension (Acts 1:14).

We cannot help but note, on occasions 1 and 2, that when Jesus addressed her, or spoke of her, there was a sound of reproof in His words. It is evident that she was blessed with the gift of humility. She received her Son's reproof without anger at Cana. Throughout His ministry, she put herself in the background. On the occasion that she desired to speak with her Son, she was not moved by arrogance or by a desire to show her authority, but by a mother's feelings of affection for Him Whom she loved. Thus Scripture pictures her as being tender, humble, faithful, patient, but still a woman.

MARY'S LATER LIFE

Here, again, we pass into the region of free and "joyous" legend. According to this, Mary continued to live with John's parents near the Mount of Olives. Each day she went to pray at Christ's tomb and at Golgotha. The Jews tried to prevent prayers from being spoken at these places because a tumult was made, and they gave orders to stone Mary. Instead, they spoke to her, and she agreed to go to live in Bethlehem. Twenty-two years after Christ's Ascension, Mary felt a burning desire to be with her Son. An angel appeared to her and told her that her soul would be taken from her body on the third day. He placed a palm branch from paradise in her hands and desired that it should be carried before her bier. Mary requested that the apostles might be gathered about her before she died. So the Holy Spirit caught up John in Ephesus, Peter and Paul at Rome, Thomas in India, along with Matthew and James, the only apostles who were still living, and brought them to Bethlehem. In addition, the Holy Spirit awakened the dead Philip and Andrew and Luke and Simon and Mark and Bartholomew, and snatched them also to Bethlehem. Angels descended from heaven and hovered about the house. Gabriel stood at her head and Michael at her feet, and they fanned her with their wings. Peter and John wiped away her tears. They all cried out: "Hail, blessed one! Blessed is the fruit of thy womb!" The people of Bethlehem brought their sick to the house, and they were all healed. The king at Jerusalem heard

of all these things going on, so he sent and commanded that Mary and the disciples should be brought to Jerusalem. When the horsemen came to Bethlehem to seize Mary, they could not find her, for the Holy Spirit had taken her and the disciples in a cloud over the heads of the horsemen. They did see angels ascending and descending at the spot where Mary's house was. The governor gave permission to the priests to burn her house, but when they came near to the house a fire burst forth on them which utterly consumed them.

Soon after, the Holy Spirit commanded the apostles to take Mary up to Jerusalem and from there to Gethsemane. There on a Sunday morning, Adam and Eve, Seth, Shem, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, and the rest of the fathers came to her, as did Enoch, Elijah, and Moses. Innumerable angels came. Christ appeared also. The disciples came near and besought her to pray for the world which she was about to leave. She did. Then her Son put forth His hands and received her pure soul and bore it to His Father's house. The apostles placed her body in a new tomb in the valley of Jehoshaphat. Suddenly Jesus appeared, and the apostles besought Him to raise the body of Mary and take it with Him in glory to heaven. Jesus then commanded Michael the archangel to bring down the soul of Mary. Gabriel rolled away the stone from the tomb and Jesus commanded her to rise. Immediately Mary arose, and the Lord gave her to the angels to be carried to paradise. Unfortunately, Thomas was not present for this occasion either, and again he said: "Unless I see, I will not believe." The disciples showed him the empty tomb with only the grave clothes lying there. Then Thomas confessed that he, too, as he was borne in the cloud from India, had seen her holy body being carried by the angels with great triumph into heaven. He then cried to her for her blessing, and she graciously bestowed upon him her precious Girdle, which when the apostles saw they were glad. Then the apostles were all carried back to their own places.

MARY WORSHIP

What, then, is the origin of the great devotion which the Roman Catholic Church renders to Mary? It is surely not to be found in the Bible. Our creeds say nothing about it.

Nor is there anything in the writings of the fathers during the first five centuries. The doctrine is not to be found in the writers of the first century: Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp. There is nothing of the sort in the writings of the second century: Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian. There is nothing of the sort in the writings of the third century: Origen, Cyprian, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Nethodius, Lactantius. There is nothing of the sort in the writings of the fourth century: Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Hilary, Macarius, Epiphanius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Ephrem Syrus, Gregory of Nyssa, and Ambrose. And there is nothing of the sort in the writings of the fifth century: Chrysostom, Augustine, Jerome, Theodoret, Cyril of Alexandria, Popes Leo, Hilarus, Simplicius, Felix, Gelasius, Anastasius, Symmachus, and others. So where did this devotion to Mary arise? Since it did not originate in Scripture nor during the first five centuries after Christ, it could have originated only in the apocryphal legends depicting her earlier years and her later life, as we have summarized them above.

In the year 431, the Council of Ephesus sanctioned the term *θεότοκος*, which is loosely translated "Mother of God." In art, the representation of the Madonna and Child became the expression of orthodox belief. Soon the veneration of Mary began to spread within the church. She was pictured as an ideal woman, with no weaknesses. People fell down to worship the image which their imagination had set up. Evidence was not asked for. Perfection was "becoming" to the mother of the Lord; therefore she was perfect. Adoration was "befitting" on the part of Christians; therefore they gave it. Ancient tales were received as genuine. Any revelations supposedly made to favored saints were accepted as true. The Madonna reigned as queen in heaven, in earth, in purgatory, and over hell. By her adoring followers she has been called: Queen of Mercy, Mother of all mankind, our Life, our Protectress in death, the Hope of all, our only Refuge, Help and Asylum, the Propitiatory of the whole world, the one City of Refuge, the Comfortress of the world, our Patroness, Queen of Heaven and Hell, our Protectress from the Divine Justice and from the Devil, the

Ladder of Paradise, the Gate of Heaven, the Mediatrix of grace, the Dispenser of all graces, the Helper of the Redemption, the Co-operator in our Justification, a tender Advocate, Omnipotent, the great Peace-maker, the Throne prepared in mercy, the Way of Salvation, the Mediatrix of angels, the Way, the Door, the Intercessor, the Redeemer, and even the Savior. Surely one must say that such adoration could only take glory away from Christ. Mary herself would reject such idolatrous admiration, for we remember her saying: "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Savior."

MARY'S IMMACULATE CONCEPTION

During the first five centuries, any ideas that Mary was exempt from even actual sins of weakness and imperfection were found only outside the Church. Nevertheless the practice developed of looking upon Mary as an example to other women. From his imagination, Ambrose drew a very beautiful picture of what a girl ought to be, and attached it to Mary. Jerome spoke of her light as hiding the little fires of other women. Augustine often speaks of her as being under original sin, but says that perhaps God gave her sufficient grace to keep her from actual sin. By the 12th century, it was almost universally held in the Roman Church that Mary was preserved from actual sin. In the 13th and 14th centuries, the idea grew of her Immaculate Conception. Thereafter a struggle went on between the opponents and proponents of this theory. This culminated in the decree on December 8, 1854, by Pope Pius IX, in which Mary's Immaculate Conception (sinlessness from the time of her conception) was declared to be the official dogma of the Roman Catholic Church. Incidentally, this was done before the Pope himself was declared to be personally infallible at Vatican Council I.

Vatican Council II was aware of the charge that devotion to Mary was tending to bestow on her worship that is due to God alone. By a small majority, the bishops decided not to issue a separate document on the "Blessed Virgin," as originally planned. They tried to effect a "prudent compromise" between the two sides, avoiding the task of critically examining their Church's theology regarding Mary, by saying:

"The Synod does not, however, have in mind a complete doctrine on Mary, nor does it wish to decide those questions which have not yet been fully illuminated by the work of theologians. Those opinions therefore may be lawfully retained which are freely propounded by schools of Catholic thought concerning her who occupies a place in the Church which is the highest after Christ and yet very close to us."²

MARY'S ASSUMPTION

The dogma of Mary's Assumption into heaven was declared by Pope Pius XII, on November 1, 1950. By this doctrine is meant that Mary was assumed body and soul into the glory of heaven. Catholics must believe this comparatively new teaching, which is based, as we have seen, on mere legend. Vatican Council II spoke as follows concerning this:

"Finally, preserved free from all guilt of original sin, the Immaculate Virgin was taken up body and soul into heavenly glory upon the completion of her earthly sojourn. She was exalted by the Lord as Queen of all, in order that she might be the more thoroughly conformed to her Son, the Lord of lords, and the conqueror of sin and death."³

Thus Vatican Council II reaffirmed the two dogmas of Mary's Immaculate Conception and her Assumption into heaven. The Council came very close to declaring a third dogma, which would bestow on her the title of "Co-Redemptrix with Christ." But it was felt that this would not be in accord with the purpose of the Council, which was to change no essential doctrines or to define no new doctrines. Then, too, this would have stirred up much opposition from Protestant churches, and that would have defeated the ecumenical goals of the Council. Nevertheless, the Council did say this:

"By decree of divine Providence, she served on earth as ... an associate of unique nobility. ... She conceived, brought forth and nourished Christ. She presented Him to the Father in the temple, and was united with Him in suffering as He died on the Cross. In an utterly singular way she cooperated

by her obedience, faith, hope and burning charity in the Savior's work of restoring supernatural life to souls. ... Taken up to heaven, she did not lay aside this saving role, but by her manifold acts of intercession continues to win for us gifts of eternal salvation. ... Therefore the Blessed Virgin is invoked by the Church under the titles of Advocate, Auxiliatrix, Adjutrix, and Mediatrix."⁴

CONCLUSION In 1531 Luther wrote: "It is true, Mary is praiseworthy and can never be lauded and extolled enough. For the honor of having been chosen from all the women on earth to be the mother of this Infant is exceedingly high and glorious. Yet we should laud and praise the mother in such a way that we do not let the Infant she has borne be torn from our eyes and hearts, nor should we consider the Treasure born to us of less importance than the mother. The praise of the mother should be as a drop, but the praise of this Infant should be as the entire expanse of the wide sea. If one of the two is to be forgotten, it would be better to forget the mother than to forget this Infant. In the papacy the Infant was entirely forgotten, and the mother was thought of alone. But the mother was not born for us; she does not help us from sins and death. To be sure, she has borne the Infant and the Savior of all the world for us; but she herself is not the Infant and the Savior. Therefore we should wean our affections away from the mother and fasten them firmly on the Infant."⁵

Again Luther says: "On the basis of this text (John 19:25-27), Mary has been turned into an idol in the papacy; and in the very Lenten season, in which men preached Christ and His suffering, they preached the Mother Mary, saying that Christ committed and gave her to us a mother. We want to hold the dear virgin and the holy mother in all honor, as she certainly deserves to be honored; yet we do not want to honor her in such a way that we make her equal to her Son, Christ. For she was not crucified for us, nor did she die for us or pray for us on the cross; but Christ was crucified for us and died and pleaded and prayed for us with tears on the cross. Therefore honor Mother Mary as you desire; but do not accord her the honor which we should accord Christ. This,

too, is the reason why Christ puts His mother away from Him: He alone would be the One to whom we should cling."⁶

In short, Scripture teaches: "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved," (Acts 4:12). And again: "Thou shalt call His name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins," (Matthew 1:21). And Jesus said: "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life; no man cometh unto the Father, but by Me," (John 14:6). With Paul we say and confess: "For of Him, and through Him, and to Him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen," (Romans 11:36).

A. Schulz

FOOTNOTES

1. Cf. W. Arndt's *Does the Bible Contradict Itself?*, p. 53ff.
2. *Decree on the Church*, Preface to Chap. VIII, par. 54.
3. *Ibid.*, par. 59.
4. *Ibid.*, par. 62.
5. St. L. Ed., XIIIb: 2596.
6. St. L. Ed., VIII: 960.



ADDRESS AT THE OPENING OF THE SCHOOL YEAR AT IMMANUEL LUTHERAN COLLEGE

TEXT: *Psalm 8:1* — "O Lord our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth! who hast set thy glory above the heavens."

In Christ Jesus, dear fellow-redeemed:

The name of our school, "Immanuel Lutheran College," has been a familiar name to you as you have verbalized it orally and in writing quite a few times during the past few weeks, I am sure. You saw it on all the communica-

tions from our office. You wrote it on all your letters and responses. You told your friends that you were going to attend Immanuel Lutheran College. You saw the name on the sign as you turned into the campus from Grover Road.

But how often have you thought and meditated on what this name really means, especially the name "Immanuel" — God with us? It is the name of our God and Savior — the most majestic, the most excellent name in all the earth, a name the glory and the splendor of which is displayed above the heavens. Indeed, the moon shines brightly, the stars as well, and especially the sun — but not as brightly as the Sun of righteousness, which outshines them all! This is the Lord our God by Whose name our school is called. It tells the world that this is a "Jesus-school," a school where the name of Jesus characterizes the instruction, the training, the guidance, the discipline, the counselling that is here given. It means that those who teach here and those who are students here are children of Jesus, true Jesus-people who wish to honor and to hallow the name of the Lord Who has bought them and redeemed them and freed them from all their sins.

Indeed, the name of God, the name "Immanuel," is not just an empty name with no real meaning or power. Think of what Jesus said: "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in My name, He will give it you." Think of what the apostle Peter said: "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." It was in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost that you were baptized and thus born again unto a new life. In the very first petition of the Lord's Prayer we have been taught to say, "Hallowed be Thy name," which means, as Luther says, that we are here asking that God's name, which is holy in itself, may be hallowed among us by true teaching and godly life. We are asking God to preserve us from profaning the name of God, which takes place when people lead lives of speaking and acting in such a way that the name of God is dishonored and sullied and dragged down into the dirt. It was in the name of Jesus that the disciples performed many miracles, healing the

sick and even raising the dead. Recall the words of the seventy disciples who had been sent out by Jesus. When they returned, they returned with joy, for, as they said, "Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through Thy name." When Peter and John met a crippled man at the gate of the temple, Peter said to him: "Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have give I thee; in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk." And he arose and walked.

This name of Immanuel is not just an empty sound or merely a way of identifying the One Whom we worship and to Whom we pray. The name and all that attaches to it — "Wonderful, Counsellor, the everlasting Father, the Prince of peace" — this is the Mighty God Himself!

So important is the name of our God that one whole commandment out of ten says to us, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh His name in vain." We are not to use this name or anything that attaches to it in a light and frivolous way, but we are to use it in prayer, in praise, and in thanksgiving.

Now, as we are about to enter upon the new school year, it behooves us all — teachers, parents, and students — to live and speak in such a manner that the name of our God may be hallowed, and not profaned. Nothing should come forth in the classroom which would run counter to the Word of our God. No behavior pattern should come to the surface which would be a negation of our avowed determination to hallow the name of our God. Dormitory life, our association with one another, the aims which we set before us, the image which we set before the world — all should be a reflection of the glory which we have experienced through the name of Jesus Christ — Immanuel: God with us. And when we slip, may it be the cause of greatest regret as we confess our sins and seek God's forgiveness in Jesus' name.

And so, with a prayer for God's blessings, we begin our school year in the name of Jesus, our Immanuel.

C. M. Gullerud



JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY
CHURCH OF THE LUTHERAN CONFESSION
IMMANUEL LUTHERAN COLLEGE

West Grover Road

EAU CLAIRE, WISCONSIN 54701



RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED
ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED

U. S. POSTAGE
Permit No. 34
PAID
EAU CLAIRE, WIS.
Non-Profit
Organization