



**"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 21

MARCH 1981

NUMBER 1

ISSN 0361-1906

THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

VOLUME 21

MARCH 1981

NUMBER 1

CONTENTS

TOPICS ON THE TENSES: PROHIBITIONS 2
C. Kuehne

DOES THE FIRST COMMANDMENT DEMAND JUSTIFYING FAITH? .. 10
Erwin E. Kowalke (Tr. by R. Dommer)

LUTHER ON THE MARRIAGES OF THE PATRIARCHS 21
Paul F. Nolting

BOOK REVIEW: *Church Fellowship* 36
John Lau

BOOK NOTICE: *No Other Gospel* 43
C. M. Gullerud

The JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY is published at Immanuel Lutheran College, W. Grover Road, Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701, by authorization of the Church of the Lutheran Confession. Subscriptions: \$5.00 per year, \$9.00 for two years, payable in advance. Issues are dated: March, June, September, and December.

Editor Prof. C. M. Gullerud
Managing Editor Prof. John Lau
Circulation Manager Mr. Benno Sydow
2750 Oxford Street North
Roseville, Minnesota 55113
Staff Contributors R. Dommer, C. Kuehne, P. F.
Nolting, Robert Reim, R. E.
Wehrwein.

Correspondence regarding subscriptions, renewals, changes of address, etc., should be directed to the Circulation Manager. Correspondence regarding material published in the JOURNAL should be directed to the editors, in care of Immanuel Lutheran College.

TOPICS ON THE TENSES: PROHIBITIONS

Prohibitions are negative commands, commands with an attached "not" or some other negative expression. "Keep on rejoicing in the Lord always" (Phil. 4:4) is a command; "Stop sinning" (I Cor. 15:34) is a prohibition. Here both the command and the prohibition have the force of evangelical admonition, as is true so often in the New Testament. Again, "Save yourself and us" (Luke 23:39) is a command, while "Do not enter into the village" (Mark 8:26) is a prohibition. Among the Ten Commandments, "Keep honoring your father and mother" (Eph. 6:2) is a command, and "You shall not commit adultery" (Matt. 5:27) is a prohibition.

Prior to the writing of this article a survey was made of the Greek New Testament to find as many prohibitions as possible. These prohibitions were then studied in their contexts, with careful attention being paid to the tenses and modes employed by the holy writers. The conclusions drawn from this study are summarized below. To keep this article from becoming too prolix, the discussion is limited to prohibitions in the 2nd person.

PROHIBITIONS EMPLOYING THE PRESENT IMPERATIVE

Of all the prohibitions in the New Testament, those employing the present tense in Greek form the largest group, a total of 126 being found. In studying them it is essential to remember that the primary force of the Greek present is durative or linear action, commonly depicted by a line: (———). While it is true that in the indicative mode some present tense forms are found to be aoristic, this is not true in the imperative mode which is used in these prohibitions. Whenever a person finds a prohibition in the present tense, therefore, he should proceed on the assumption that the writer is depicting the action as linear.

The negative found in present-tense prohibitions is uniformly μή ("not") or some compound thereof. When this particle is combined with a present imperative in a prohibition, the resulting idea is the negating of linear

action, or more simply the forbidding of a certain course of action. Note well, now, the two situations which arise: 1) If in a given passage the person to whom the prohibition is expressed is already in the process of doing the action, the prohibition forbids the continuance of that action. Translations such as the following are then appropriate: "Don't go on doing what you are doing," "Stop doing it," "Quit doing it," "Cease doing it," and such like. 2) If, however, it is apparent that the person is not doing the action at the time that the present-tense prohibition is expressed, one would have to render it: "Don't ever be doing it," "Never do it," and such like. The grammarian A. T. Robertson in his writings frequently suggests as a translation here: "Do not have the habit of doing it." Unfortunately, this rendition can be misunderstood. A student in a beginning Greek class once asked in all seriousness: "Is it O.K. then for a person to do it once in a while, so long as he doesn't get into the habit of doing it?" This is decidedly not the meaning of the Greek. The action in question is not to be done at any time at all — ever!

In the narrative sections of the New Testament, found chiefly in the four Gospels and Acts, the first of the above distinctions is definitely the more common: "Stop doing what you are doing." Compare the following examples of present-tense prohibitions: "But Jesus said: 'Permit the little children to come to me and stop hindering (μὴ κωλύετε) them,'" (Matt. 19:14). During Holy Week Jesus said to the crowds of festival worshippers in Jerusalem: "The scribes and the Pharisees have sat down on Moses' seat. All things therefore which they tell you, do and continue to keep; but stop doing (μὴ ποιεῖτε) according to their works," (Matt. 23:2-3). In Mark 9:38-39 we read that the disciple John had tried to prevent a man from driving out demons in Jesus' name because "he is not following us." Jesus replied to John: "Stop hindering (μὴ κωλύετε) him."

Luke uses more present-tense prohibitions having the force "Stop doing what you're doing" than any other New Testament writer. He reports the following words of John the Baptist to the publicans who had come to be baptized: "Stop collecting anything more (μὴδὲν πράσσετε) than what

you have been commanded to," (3:13). As Jesus approached the funeral procession coming out of Nain, He said to the grieving widow: "Stop sobbing (μὴ κλαῖτε)," (7:13). In Luke 8:49 we read that someone came from the house of Jairus and reported: "Your daughter is dead; do not go on troubling the Teacher any longer (μηκέτι σκύλλε)." And when Jesus arrived at Jairus' home He ordered the mourners: "Stop weeping (μὴ κλαίετε)," (8:52 NASB). After their missionary journey, the seventy-two heard this reminder from the Savior: "Nevertheless, do not go on rejoicing (μὴ χαίρετε) in this that the spirits submit to you, but be rejoicing that your names have been recorded in heaven," (10:20). The man who did not want to be disturbed at midnight by his neighbor responded: "Quit troubling me (μὴ μου κόπους πάρεχε)," (11:7). On the way to the cross Jesus said to the wailing women of Jerusalem: "Stop weeping (μὴ κλαίετε) for Me," (23:28 NASB).

Here are several more examples from the New Testament of μὴ with the present imperative having the force of "Stop doing what you are doing." John 2:16: "Stop making (μὴ ποιεῖτε) My Father's house a house of merchandise," (NASB). John 5:14 and 8:11: "Do not go on sinning any longer (μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε)." John 6:43: "Stop your grumbling (μὴ γογγύζετε)." John 20:17: "Stop clinging (μὴ ἄπτου) to Me," (NASB). Acts 18:9: "Stop being afraid (μὴ φοβοῦ), but go on speaking and do not be silent." Acts 20:10: "Stop being alarmed (μὴ θορυβεῖσθε)." Rev. 5:5: "Stop weeping (μὴ κλαῖτε)."

It is a striking Gospel fact that the verb most commonly found in this type of prohibition in the New Testament is "Stop being afraid" (μὴ φοβοῦ in the singular, or μὴ φοβεῖσθε in the plural). We sinners are by nature fearful whenever we come face to face with God or His holy angels, for we are conscious of our guilt. But because God has redeemed us from sin in His dear Son, Jesus Christ, we are exhorted to give up our fear and rejoice in the salvation that is ours. We should notice well how carefully Scripture in almost every case backs up the prohibition, "Stop being afraid," with some comforting Gospel truth. This Gospel, in fact, gives the sinner the ability to put away his fear. A few examples of this follow.

Zacharias was terrified when he saw Gabriel before him in the temple, but the angel quickly calmed him: "Stop being afraid, Zacharias, because your supplication has been heard," (Luke 1:13). To Mary several months later the angel said: "Stop being afraid, Mary, for you have found favor (grace) with God," (Luke 1:30). On the field of Bethlehem, the frightened shepherds heard the encouraging words: "Fear not — stop being afraid: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord," (Luke 2:10-11 KJV). When Peter saw the miracle of the great catch of fish he fell at Jesus' knees and said: "Go away from me, because I am a sinful man, O Lord." Jesus responded to his terror with the words: "Stop being afraid; from now on you will be catching men alive," (Luke 5:8-10). To the frightened disciples on the stormy Sea of Galilee, the approaching Jesus spoke these reassuring words: "Be of good cheer. It is I. Stop being afraid," (Matt. 14:27). On the mount of transfiguration Jesus came to the terrified three, touched them, and said: "Get up, and stop being afraid," (Matt. 17:7). The evangelist John quoted the Old Testament prophet in connection with Jesus' entry into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday: "Stop being afraid, daughter of Zion; behold your King is coming," (John 12:15). At the empty tomb the angel announced the most glorious news that has ever been heard by sinful mankind: "Stop being afraid, for I know that you are seeking Jesus, the crucified. He is not here, for He has risen, even as He said," (Matt. 28:5-6). And to the trembling John the risen and ascended Lord spoke these words: "Fear not — stop being afraid; I am the first and the last: I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen," (Rev. 1:17-18 KJV). All of these "Stop being afraid" passages are pure Gospel!

In the foregoing paragraphs it can be seen how in the narrative portions of the New Testament prohibitions employing $\mu\eta$ and the present imperative commonly have the force: "Stop doing what you are doing." In the sections containing admonitions or exhortations, such as the sermons of Jesus or the closing chapters of Paul's letters, most of the present-tense prohibitions are best rendered

in the second way mentioned above: "Don't ever be doing it" or "Never do it." For in the majority of cases there is no clear evidence in the context that the persons addressed are already engaged in doing what is forbidden.

There are exceptions to this, of course. Consider Christ's warning in the Sermon on the Mount, addressed to His disciples: "Lay not up (μὴ θησαυρίζετε) for yourselves treasures upon earth," (Matt. 6:19 KJV). When we remember that numbered among these disciples was the thief, Judas Iscariot, we recognize how it is possible to render it: "Stop laying up for yourselves treasures upon earth." We know also that members of the Corinthian congregation were guilty of passing judgment upon their God-given ministers. Hence it is appropriate to render verse 5 of chapter 4 as the NASB has done: "Therefore do not go on passing judgment (μὴ κρίνετε) before the time." The translation of verse 34 of chapter 15 is also apt: "Become sober-minded as you ought, and stop sinning (μὴ ἀμαρτάνετε); for some have no knowledge of God." Similarly, we may render Gal. 5:1: "Stop being held in (μὴ ἐνέχεσθε) again by a yoke of slavery," for the Galatians were in the process of transferring from the Gospel of freedom to the Law of bondage. And, knowing the situation to which James was addressing himself in his epistle, we may translate the prohibition at 5:9: "Stop complaining (μὴ στενάζετε), brethren, against one another."

Yet, as has been said, in most cases we do better to understand the present-tense prohibitions in the admonitory sections of the New Testament in the sense: "Do not ever be doing it," for we generally lack the evidence that the persons addressed were at the time involved in the things forbidden. As an illustration of this, compare these exhortations from Ephesians: "Do not ever grieve (μὴ λυπεῖτε) the Holy Spirit of God," (4:30). "Never have fellowship (μὴ συγκαινωνεῖτε) with the unfruitful works of darkness," (5:11). "Do not ever be drunk (μὴ μεθύσκεσθε) with wine," (5:18). "Do not ever provoke your children to anger (μὴ παροργίζετε)," (6:4). The examples could be multiplied from the other epistles.

four examples were found in the New Testament of prohibitions in the second person employing μή, or some compound of μή, with the aorist subjunctive. (Note that aorist-tense prohibitions use the subjunctive mode, not the imperative.) To understand their force, we must remember that the aorist tense is punctiliar, simply pointing to an action without describing it in terms of duration, completion, or in any other way. The tense is commonly represented by a point: (·)¹

Inasmuch as the aorist tense focuses the attention on the action as such, stressing the action without reference to duration or result, it is the appropriate tense for strong, peremptory prohibitions. It emphatically forbids the committing of an act, and can best be rendered in English with a simple "Do not do it!"

Robertson and other grammarians who have followed in his footsteps emphasize that the aorist tense in prohibitions is routinely ingressive, used for actions that have not yet begun and having the force: "Do not begin to do it."² It must be admitted that some aorist prohibitions are clearly ingressive, such as that found in Luke 12:11: "And when they bring you before the synagogues and the rulers and the authorities, do not become anxious (μὴ μεριμνήσητε) about how or what you should speak in your defense, or what you should say," (NASB, my emphasis). Compare also 2 Thess. 3:13: "But as for you, brethren, do not grow weary (μὴ ἐγκακήσητε) of doing good," (NASB, my emphasis). It should be noted that the aorist tense commonly has an ingressive force when used with verbs which denote a state or condition, such as the above examples.³

But for most of the aorist-tense prohibitions in the New Testament it seems grammatically unnecessary, and at times contextually suspect, to insist on the idea of "beginning" or "becoming." As stated above, it is generally sufficient to render them with a simple "Do not do it!" A few examples will have to suffice. Matt. 6:2: "When therefore you are doing alms, do not sound a trumpet (μὴ σαλπίζης) before you!" Matt. 23:8: "Do not be called (μὴ κληθῆτε) Rabbi!" Mark 5:7: "Do not torment (μὴ βασανύσης) me!" Luke 10:4: "Do not greet anyone (μηδένα

ἀσπάσθητε) on the way!" Luke 11:4: "And lead us not into (μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς) temptation!" John 3:7: "Do not marvel (μὴ θαυμάσῃς)!" (The context indicates that Nicodemus was already marveling when Jesus uttered this prohibition. Thus the aorist cannot be ingressive.) Acts 7:60: "Lord, do not place (μὴ στήσῃς) this sin against them!" 1 Tim. 5:1: "Do not sharply rebuke (μὴ ἐπιπλήξῃς) an older man! (NASB). Heb. 3:8: "Do not harden (μὴ σκληρύνῃτε) your hearts!" Rev. 7:3: "Do not hurt (μὴ ἀδικήσῃτε) the earth or the sea or the trees!" Rev. 22:10: "Do not seal (μὴ σφραγίσῃς) the words of the prophecy of this book!"

PROHIBITIONS EMPLOYING
THE FUTURE INDICATIVE

This writer found only fifteen examples of prohibitions employing οὐ ("not") with the future indicative — the third and last type of second-person prohibition in the New Testament.

The combination of οὐ with the future indicative reminds one of a parallel construction in the Old Testament, namely, כִּי־לֹא with the imperfect, this Hebrew construction commonly being used of solemn, absolute, permanent prohibitions. In fact, all but one of the examples of οὐ with the future indicative in the New Testament involve a quotation from the Old Testament. Yet the idiom is not a pure Hebraism, since examples can be found in secular Greek literature.⁴

In Matt. 4:7 Jesus answers Satan's temptation by citing Deut. 6:16: "You shall not put to the test (οὐκ ἐκπειράσεις) the Lord your God." In Matt. 5:21, 27 and 19:18 several of the Ten Commandments are quoted: "You shall not commit murder (οὐ φονεύσεις)"; "You shall not commit adultery (οὐ μοιχεύσεις)"; "You shall not steal (οὐ κλέψεις)"; "You shall not bear false witness (οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις)." Compare Rom. 7:7 and 13:9 for another of the commandments: "You shall not covet (οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις)." The one example which does not involve a quote from the Old Testament is Matt. 6:5: "You shall not be (οὐκ ἔσεσθε) as the hypocrites."

In the above passages it is clearly seen that the future tense can have a volitive force, expressing the

will of the speaker. In this respect it manifests the force of a mode, being similar here to the imperative and subjunctive modes.

CONCLUDING REMARKS For the sake of brevity this discussion was restricted to prohibitions in the second person. Three types were presented: μή with the present imperative, μή with the aorist subjunctive, and οὐ with the future indicative – three different tenses with three different modes.

Prohibitions can be found also in the third person (example: "Let there be no one dwelling in it" (Acts 1: 20), and there are a number of negative exhortations in the first person (example: "Let us not tear it" (John 19:24). It can be affirmed that the forces of the tenses in second-person prohibitions, as described in this article, will be found also in those constructions involving the first and third persons.

C. Kuehne

NOTES

1. For a discussion of the force of the aorist tense, cf. the article "Keeping the Aorist in its Place," *Journal of Theology*, Vol. 16, No. 3 (September, 1976), pp. 2-10.
2. For numerous examples of this emphasis, cf. Robertson's *Word Pictures in the New Testament* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1930-33).
3. Further illustrations of the ingressive aorist can be found in the article "The Viewpoints of the Aorist," *Journal of Theology*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (March, 1978), pp. 5-6.
4. Cf. the first part of B. L. Gildersleeve's *Syntax of Classical Greek* (New York: American Book Co., 1900), pp. 116-117.

DOES THE FIRST COMMANDMENT DEMAND JUSTIFYING FAITH?*

According to Exodus 20:2-6, the First Commandment reads: "I am the Lord, thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments."

This commandment, as does the whole giving of the law, applies first of all to the people of Israel, as the words, "who has led you out of Egypt, out of the land of bondage," clearly indicate. The whole giving of the law on Sinai, in fact, applies to the people of Israel in exactly the same way as the first commandment. In practice there was no difference between moral, political, or ceremonial law — a transgression of the political law was as much a sin against God as a transgression of the moral law or a transgression of some food ordinance. The law, the whole law, pertained to Israel. "And six years thou shalt sow thy land, but the seventh year thou shalt let it rest" (Ex. 23:10) was God's law in exactly the same sense as "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," (Ex. 20:3).

But the giving of the law applied only to the people of Israel — not to Moab or Edom or our heathen forefathers. It was exclusively Israel's law from beginning to

* This paper was given by Professor Erwin Kowalke to the Central Pastoral Conference of the Wisconsin Synod in February, 1931. The original is in the German language and the translator is Professor Robert Dommer, of Immanuel Lutheran College.

end. It was neither given nor appointed for other nations; it served rather as a wall around Israel that closed it in and other nations out. If a heathen person wanted to come under the law covenant, he needed first to be circumcised, and then first the conditions of the law would apply also to him. Of course, the non-Israelite had his own law that God had revealed to him when He created man; he was a law to himself and proved that the works of the law were written in his heart, as his conscience bore witness (Romans 1 & 2).

The law, therefore (and by that I mean the whole Sinaitic law), pertained to Israel, and to no other nation under heaven. The other nations had their own natural law, their own works of the law, their own sins, their own condemnation. That the natural law incidentally corresponds with the Sinaitic law does not change the matter.

Who is the giver of the law? He places His name as the very first word of the whole law: "I, Anokhi, Adonai, Elohekha, I, the Lord your God." That is not simply a superscription; it is the holy source of the law. This is the word that gives substance and weight and power and authority to the whole law. This "I" resounds with power through the whole law until the last word has been spoken. The one Who declares Himself as the "I" describes Himself so accurately that Israel can be in no doubt who He is. "The Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." With these words, God in a very concise way portrayed to the Israelites their whole history and the history of their fathers. They were reminded how they were "all under the cloud and all passed through the sea and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat and did all drink the same spiritual drink, for they drank of that spiritual rock which followed them, and that rock was Christ," (1 Cor. 10:1-4). I, Adonai, your God, am the very same God that instituted the Passover with its glorious meaning; that appeared to Moses in the burning bush and sent him back to his people with the instructions: "I am hath sent me unto you," (Ex. 3:14); the same one who called Abraham out of Ur in the Chaldees in order to make him a great

people and to bless in him all the nations of the earth; the same One who promised the Seed of the woman that should bruise the head of the serpent; the same One that created heaven and earth. This is how God revealed Himself to His people and this is how Israel knew Him, the One who now under the name, "I, Adonai, your God," delivered the law to them.

Should someone object that the words, "I, Adonai, your God," do not belong to the First Commandment, I would reply that these words indeed belong to the giving of the law on Sinai, and that without them a person cannot understand the First Commandment. If one should leave these words off, and call them only an introduction, how would the First Commandment sound? "Thou shalt have no other gods beside me." Beside whom? A person either takes these words as a part of the First Commandment or he does not. If we want to explain the First Commandment, then we need to make clear who is speaking when he says, "beside me." And it will not work to explain the little word, "me" (beside me), with the indefinite name, "God," since God Himself has given another explanation when He said, "I, Adonai, your God," that is, the One whom you have learned to know as your covenant-God.

Farther on the Lord says, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the seas. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor serve them, for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God," (Ex. 20:4-5a). What does this mean except this, that there is no other God in heaven or in earth or beneath the earth than the One who calls Himself the Adonai Elohim; and that we dare not make or imagine or even dream about any other God than this One, who is God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, the Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End, who is and was and who is coming?

Is Christ the Son comprehended in the "I" and "beside me"? Of course. Here it is the true, everlasting, unchanging Godhead that is speaking, including the whole indivisible person of Christ, which can never and in no way be separated from the Godhead. This is the very

Christ that carried the curse of the sins, that He here forbade, in His own body and damned this curse into hell. The One speaking here is the whole God, the complete God, the Giver of the law, the Dispenser of grace, the Indivisible. This is the One who calls Himself "I" and says, "Thou shalt have no other gods beside me."

In a sermon on Deuteronomy in 1529, Luther wrote this about the First Commandment: "Out of this commandment as out of a well or fountain flow all the teachings of the prophets and psalms, indeed, all curses, threats and promises. . . . All the prophets and the whole Old and New Testaments are derived from the First Commandment, for God connects everything to Himself and would say: 'If I am your God, why do you not trust my goodness, and instead trust others more than me?' Christ is also comprehended here as it is most clearly pointed out in the 18th chapter, 'I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren,' (Dt. 18:18). These words embrace Christ, in whom they should believe and hope and to whom they should totally commit themselves. This First Commandment is a huge concept: 'I am the Lord your God'; in this everything is contained, and all laws and teachings and order must be directed and guided in accordance with it . . . for, indeed, no worship is carried on with God's Word except as it involves believing in Christ; such worship is earnestly enjoined us in the New Testament and Old Testament alike. . . . Therefore God placed the Ten Commandments until Christ, whom the Jews should take for themselves and believe in because Christ is embraced in the First Commandment. He is the God that led them out of Egypt. . . . Moses indicated that this name, God, 'who hath led thee out of the land of Egypt,' was to have meaning for Israel only until the Prophet, Christ, came. Now Christ is come and the Scripture is fulfilled and God has received another name from His dear Son, Christ, who has led us out of the power of sin, death, the devil and hell and has redeemed us. Therefore Christ is embraced as much in the First Commandment as is God the Father." (Weimar Ed., Vol. 29, p. 595 ff.)

When we say that the First Commandment enjoins faith in Christ as well as the Father, we do not mean that this commandment might offer grace to the person who does not

keep it. The First Commandment, although it speaks of Christ, offers no forgiveness to the person who refuses to obey Christ. The essence of the commandment lies in the "Thou shalt," and God Himself reiterates that He will bless you if you keep it and curse you if you do not. In this respect the commandment is inexorable. It demands obedience; it makes no compromises; it at no time even hints at a forgiveness. This commandment demands an unconditional faith in the Triune God with all His attributes and works and words, but it does not preach as much as one syllable of the forgiveness of the sin of unbelief. Israel showed that it understood this clearly when they, on Mt. Ebel, spoke both a festive "Amen" to the curses for disobedience as well as a similar "Amen" to the blessings for obedience.

When God says in the First Commandment, "Thou shalt have no other gods beside me," He demands that you accept Him as the God who reveals Himself in His Word and deeds. He is one God; there is no other; and you dare make no image of Him other than the image that He Himself has given, namely, that His every word, whether curse, threatening, blessing, promise, Law or Gospel is the Word of God, that you should believe in Him as God, Father, Son and Spirit. That is what God demands of you! In this commandment, however, God does not give you this faith; He does not even promise it. That is, in fact, the great difference between Law and Gospel; the Law only demands; it demands that I should give, perform and do, and offers no hope if I fail. The Gospel gives me everything in Christ, and performs and does everything for me that the Law has demanded or can demand.

Is it not, then, almost a mixing of Law and Gospel when we assert that Christ as well as the Father has given the Law, and that the Law demands faith and everything that could make a man just before God? This is not a mixing if one can keep two truths straight. First, that the Law only demands, and damns me if I do not perform of my own powers what is demanded; and, contrariwise, that the Gospel gives purely by grace everything that the Law demands: righteousness, holiness, sinlessness, faith, obedience. Secondly, that the Law pertains only to the unrighteous, the unbeliever, the Old Adam.

The question was asked at our last conference whether the First Commandment demands justifying faith. This question contains such a contradiction in itself, that as it is stated, it cannot be answered. The First Commandment indeed demands faith, every kind of faith, complete faith, the kind of faith that in a child-like spirit clings to everything that God is and does and says, just as Abraham simply accepted what God said to him, and God reckoned it to him for righteousness. But does the First Commandment command justifying faith? It commands that faith that accepts the Word of promise as God's Word; but it does not give that faith, it does not work it, it does not promise it and cannot give it. Justification is something that lies outside the sphere of the First Commandment and the whole Law. Justification is alone God's work and gift and is never, even in the condition of sinlessness, a performance of man and is, therefore, never commanded. God alone works justification. Justification is surely commanded in the First Commandment. Justification is, contrariwise, the free gift of righteousness for Christ's sake. Law is an unconditional demand; justification is an unconditional forgiveness and gift. There is no greater contradiction.

Why the Law? It was added because of transgressions (Gal. 3:19). The Law was given on account of sin. It was to lead to the acknowledgment of sin. It was to make sin "exceeding sinful," (Rom. 7:13). It was to mark as damning sin every natural and purely human power and weakness, omission and commission, virtue and vice, faith and unbelief, love and hate. "The Scripture hath concluded all under sin," (Gal. 3:22). The Law is simply to reduce natural man to nothing. "For if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law," (Gal. 3:22). The Law has to do strictly with sin; that is why it is completely powerless to work any good. In and by itself the Law is "holy, just and good," (Rom. 7:12). Yet, when it is applied to the sinner, it only makes his sins greater. It was given for life, and yet works only death for the sinner. It demands righteousness and works damnation. It is the office of the Law to preach death and damnation (2 Cor. 3:7.9). We ought to be careful, however, that we do not complain about the Law. If we want to complain

about anything, we ought to complain about our sinful flesh. The blame does not lie with the Law that it reduces me to nothing and cannot save; the blame lies with me and my sin. The Law is holy and demands only good; I can only perform evil. "Sin working death in me by that which is good," (Rom. 7:13).

Do the Law and the First Commandment apply to me? There are two answers. The first is, "No." The Law from beginning to end simply does not apply to me at all. Should someone ask in regard to the First Commandment, "Who is this 'I' to whom the Law does not pertain?" the answer is: it is the one to whom God said, "Fear not, for I have redeemed thee. I have called thee by thy name — thou art mine," (Is. 43:1). Therefore I can say without fear to the Law, "Yes, friend Law, what you demand, threaten, curse and damn indeed applies to the sinner who must flee before God, but it does not apply to me." The same God Who gave the Law said to me, "Go thy way; thy sins be forgiven thee" (Jer. 8:11), and sealed this forgiveness with the death and resurrection of His own Son. Christ is the end of the Law; whosoever has Christ is free from the Law and totally free. He has nothing to do with the Law and the Law demands nothing of him. "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life," (John 6:54). Christians have done that and have eternal life. We are children of God and live under the same roof; our conversation is in heaven. What can the Law that was given for the sake of sin command and curse in heaven? God calls us saints. This means that we are already what the Law demands of us. We Christians are dead to anything that pertains to Law since we were buried with Christ by baptism into death (Rom. 6:4). Therefore the Law pertains to us in precisely the same measure as the law of the land pertains to those in the grave. Paul says (Gal. 2:19): "For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God. I am crucified with Christ." And (Rom. 8:2): "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has made me free from the law of sin and death." We have died with Christ also to rise again with Him. Just as He does not die again, so also we will not die, no matter what the Law might say. Because of Christ the Law is no longer effective as far as it pertains to the Christian; it is dead to him. To the Christ-

ian as Christian the Law pertains in no respect. The Gospel says this in a thousand places and the Law knows no syllable of it. The Law only says, "Thou shalt." Christ says, "That is indeed true, but do not be alarmed. I have done everything for you." If I as a Christian cannot feel totally free from the Law, then can I neither in any way trust the Gospel. Then I can never have a good conscience, free from blame, and the freedom that should be mine through the truth amounts to nothing.

Paul says, "I delight in the law after the inward man." This means that the Law is a pleasant lecture for the inner man. Why should I, as a Christian, not find joy and delight in God's Law, i.e., God's Word? Why can I not find it refreshing and delightful to sit down and read the Ten Commandments? It damns me no longer. I am in Christ and I do not need to fear the Law any more than my Savior does. The fact that the Law curses and damns my flesh, which is of no good use and lies in the grave with Christ, this should in no way spoil my inner joy in God's Word, not even in this word: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Through Christ I have completely fulfilled this commandment, and it is my desire with the help of Christ to continue living by this Word and compelling my indolent flesh to join in with my spirit.

The Law does not pertain to the Christian as Christian, who has been enlightened by the Holy Spirit. It does not once pertain to him, either as a teaching or rule or a barrier or a mirror. Christ says to Philip (Jn. 14:9): "Have I been so long with you and yet thou hast not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father. How sayest thou then, 'Show us the Father'?" In Christ we possess a complete understanding of the Father. Ezekiel wrote (36:26), "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them." This is a knowledge and activity that flows from the Gospel. Jeremiah writes (31:33): "I will put my law in their inward parts and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people." In the next verse

he says, "And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, 'Know the Lord:' for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." Forgiveness teaches both great and small to know the Lord and His will. The Apostle Peter writes in the same way (2 Pet. 1:3): "According as his divine power hath given unto us all things (that pertain unto life and godliness) through the knowledge of him that has called us to glory and virtue."

This is also what our confessions state (F. C., Solid Decl., VI, 6): "And, indeed, if the believing and elect children of God were completely renewed in this life by the indwelling Spirit, so that in their nature and all its powers they were entirely free from sin, they would need no law, and hence no one to drive them either, but they would do of themselves, and altogether voluntarily, without any instruction, admonition, urging and driving of the law, what they are in duty bound to do according to God's will; just as the sun, the moon and all the constellations of heaven have their regular course of themselves, unobstructed, without admonition, urging, driving, force, or compulsion, according to the order of God which God once appointed for them, yea, just as the holy angels render an entirely voluntary obedience."

Why do we nevertheless continue to preach the Law? Nothing can be clearer than the passage (1 Tim. 1:9), "Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man." In reply to the question, "Does the Law apply to me?" we assert positively, "Yes, it applies to me." We ask again, "Who is the I to whom it applies?" It is the Christian who sighs with St. Paul, "O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" The body of death is his own flesh that he would love to be free of, but that he as Christian must drag around as a dead, cast-off body. We are indeed dead to flesh as Christians; we have renounced it in our baptism; but it clings to us as long as we live, and it lusts against our spirit and our spirit lusts against this flesh. Each is contrary to the other and renounces the other. Our spirit, however, is our real "I" (Rom. 1:4); we live to it;

we belong to it; we sow to it; we will reap life of the spirit (Gal. 6:8-9). By the Spirit we call God "Abba" (Gal. 4:6), and according to the Spirit there is absolutely nothing that can be brought against us. Our spirit rejoices in God's Law, loves His commandments, wants only to do God's will and hates evil. But in our flesh lies another mind. It is sold under sin; it wants to and can do only evil; it is captive to the law of sin; nothing good dwells within it, and it does the exact opposite of what the Spirit wants. "For I delight in the law of God after the inward man! But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members," (Rom. 7:22-23). The First Commandment is sweeter to the Christian than honey and the honeycomb, but it is the rod of a taskmaster and a scent of death unto death to the flesh. To this sinful flesh of the Christian belongs the Law; and it must be preached to the flesh in all its severity. "And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts," (Gal. 5:24). To crucify, to torment to death, to renounce — this is the office of the Law. Precisely those who belong to Christ exercise this hangman's-office of the Law against their own flesh in so far as it reveals their evil lusts and desires (1 Cor. 9:27). "But I keep under my body and bring it unto subjection (literally: give it a black eye)." The same Apostle writes in Rom. 8:13, "But if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." The weapon of our spirit with which we crucify our own flesh is the Law of God. The weapon of extirpation, the club of punishment and torment belongs to our old Adam, to our lustful flesh, to that "untractable, refractory ass." In this sense we understand a passage such as 1 Pet. 4:1, "Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind; for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin; that he should no longer live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God." This admonition, that here is directed to the spirit to kill the flesh, is an evangelical admonition, and the good desire and the power to make the application of the Law is a fruit of the Gospel.

In connection with the above quotation, we read from

the Formula of Concord (Solid Decl., VI, 9), "Therefore because of these lusts of the flesh, the truly believing, elect and regenerate children of God need in this life not only the daily instruction and admonition, warning and threatening, of the Law, but also frequent punishments, that they may be roused (the old man is driven out of them) and follow the Spirit of God, as it is written, Ps. 119:71, 'It is good for me that I have been afflicted, that I might learn Thy statutes.'"

Our flesh that operates on the basis of lusts stands under the Law and must be crucified, killed and buried; but we are not killed with it since our flesh does not belong to us in the real sense. We are spirit and life! Our flesh stands before us as something foreign that we treat as a dead body. St. Paul recognizes that his flesh is not his real "I." In Rom. 7:17 he says, "Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me." He and the sin that lives in him, in his flesh, are two different things, and he recognizes that the sin does not belong to him in the real sense. The sinful flesh goes its own ways, and we do not follow our flesh into the grave but follow our spirit into life. The fate of the sinful flesh is Golgotha and the sealed grave. Our fate is just the opposite — resurrection and ascension with our living Christ. Since the resurrection, law and death no longer pertain to us as Christians; what pertains to us is the Gospel of freedom and peace and life.

The Law may and should indeed rule in our flesh and frighten, torment, curse and damn our old Adam. Our flesh is the province in which the Law rules. In our conscience, however, the Law dare under no circumstances be the spokesman. There we must command the Law to be silent and obey only the word of truth, and that is the word of forgiveness in Christ our Lord. If we permit the Law to speak to us in matters that belong to our blessedness and righteousness and the peace of our conscience, then we will never have peace and never gain free access to the Father.

Erwin E. Kowalke

LUTHER ON THE MARRIAGES OF THE PATRIARCHS

Luther began lecturing on Genesis in June of 1535. He was a mature man of fifty-one years. His commentary, as we now have it, was not the work of his own pen, but was produced from the lecture notes of Veit Dietrich. The presence of successive editors is revealed, for example, in admonitions addressed to readers. The Luther scholar, Peter Meinhold, has come to the conclusion that the theology of Luther's "Lectures on Genesis" has been adulterated by the superimposition of Melancthonian theology, e.g., in arguments for the existence of God, rational arguments for the natural immortality of the human soul, defenses of astrology, etc. The overwhelming mass of material, however, is believed to reproduce Luther's thought faithfully. This is certainly true in the area of our present concern, that is, how Luther treats the multiple marriages of the patriarchs.

The reader soon observes that Luther consistently defends the chastity of the patriarchs against the slanders of the monks. The Church of Rome, then as now, held the paradoxical position that marriage is a sacrament, whereas the vow of chastity is not. Yet the state of virginity was believed to be morally superior to marriage. The monks who were possessed of a superficial conception of chastity were wont to charge the patriarchs with marrying more than one wife to satisfy their fleshly lusts. Luther had taken the vow of chastity. He had lived in an Augustinian monastery. He had also renounced his vow of chastity and had taken a wife and raised a family. On the basis of his experience, both in marriage and in the monastery, he concluded that Jacob was more chaste with his four wives than the monks with no wives.

Our method of procedure will be to let Luther speak on the pertinent chapters and verses and then summarize his position. The reader will soon become aware of the fact that in his comments Luther consistently puts into practice his own explanation of the Eighth Commandment: "We should fear and love God that we do not ... slander, nor defame our neighbor, but defend him, speak well of

him, and put the best construction on everything."

In connection with the creation of woman and the institution of marriage, Luther comments regarding the words, "It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him" (Gen. 2:18), that the "good" God was speaking of was "the common good or that of the species, not of personal good," (Vol. 1, p. 115*). But the situation was changed by the fall into sin:

Today, after our nature has become corrupted by sin, woman is needed not only to secure increase but also for companionship and for protection. The management of the household must have the ministrations of the dear ladies. In addition — and this is lamentable — woman is also necessary as an antidote against sin. And so, in the case of the woman, we must think not only of the managing of the household, which she does, but also the medicine which she is. In this respect Paul says (1 Cor. 7:2): "Because of fornication let each one have his own wife." And the Master of the "Sentences" (Peter Lombard) declares learnedly that matrimony was established in Paradise as a duty, but after sin also as an antidote. Therefore we are compelled to make use of this sex in order to avoid sin. It is almost shameful to say this, but nevertheless it is true. For there are very few who marry solely as a matter of duty. (I:116)

Subsequently Luther again speaks of woman "as a medicine against the sin of fornication" (I:118).

Commenting on celibacy in connection with Gen. 2:22, Luther wrote:

I do not deny, of course, that there are some who can live chastely without marriage. Because they have a greater gift than ordinary folk, such people can sail by their own wind. But the chastity

* All quotations are taken from Luther's Works, American Edition.

which the pope recommends to his monks, nuns, and priests is contaminated and polluted with awful sins. In addition, celibacy has been instituted without the Word of God— nay even, as the account before us bears witness, against the Word of God. (I:135)

Lamech was the first to depart from the monogamous norm established in creation. Luther comments in connection with Gen. 4:19:

A double question arises here. In the first place, the theologians discuss whether Lamech married two wives because of his lust or whether he did so for some other reason. I myself do not think that he became a polygamist solely because of his lust, but because of his desire to increase his family and because of his desire for rule, especially if, as his name indicates, the Lord at that time punished the descendants of Cain with the plague or with some other disaster. It was then that Lamech thought that he ought to repair that loss by this procedure. Similarly, some foreign nations continue the practice of polygamy even now, in order to give support and permanence both to their household and to their government. (I:317)

The two cases that shall be our concern are those of Abraham and Jacob, Isaac having practiced monogamy with Rebekah. The question arises as to the differences between the wife and the handmaid of the wife who was given the conjugal rights of the wife, on the one hand, and the wife and the concubines, on the other hand. Hagar was Sarah's handmaid. She remained that and never became a fellow-wife. Sarah did give Hagar her conjugal rights once: "Go in unto my maid," (16:2); Sarah "gave her (Hagar) to her husband to be his wife" (16:3); and "I have given my maid into thy bosom" (16:5). But this one-time surrendering of her conjugal rights did not change the relationship of Sarah to Abraham as his one wife, neither did it change the relationship of Hagar to Sarah. She remained her slave. Abraham perceived the situation the same way. Hagar was the mother of his child, but he never spoke of her as his wife. She remained Sarah's

handmaid. When Sarah's plan backfired, Abraham said to her, "Behold, thy maid is in thy hand; do to her as it pleaseth thee," (16:6). When Sarah subsequently demanded of Abraham that he "cast out this bondwoman and her son" (21:10), Abraham obeyed her after God counseled him to do what Sarah demanded. Abraham did not send his wife away; he sent Sarah's slave away, who was the mother of his son. The Angel of the Lord also never referred to Hagar as the wife of Abraham, but as Sarah's maid or slave. Thus when Hagar ran away from Sarah, the Angel of the Lord instructed her to return and submit "to thy mistress" (16:9), not to thy husband. When Abraham was grieving over the prospect of expelling Hagar and his son from his household, God said to Abraham, "Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad, and because of thy bondwoman," (21:12). Hagar always remains the bondwoman; she is never called or referred to as Abraham's wife.

How did Luther think of the relationship between Abraham and Hagar? He believed that the relationship of Abraham to Hagar in no way interrupted or violated his marriage relationship with Sarah.

Moses has reason to continue to call Sarah Abram's wife, and Abram her husband. He does so in order to show that Abram did not become an adulterer and that the earlier marriage of Sarah and Abram had not been dissolved by this new arrangement. Abram remains the chaste husband of his very chaste wife. He lies with Hagar only to prevent the promise of God from being obstructed. (III:46)

The marriage of Abraham and Sarah was intact. What was Abraham's relationship to Hagar? In his discussion of chapter 21 (IV:22-23), Luther makes the statement that "Abraham is the natural and lawful father of Ishmael; he is also one flesh with Hagar." What terminology did Luther apply to Abraham's being "one flesh with Hagar"? In continuing the discussion of Abraham's trial, Luther states that Abraham "is compelled by a twofold right, the natural and the divine, to defend his lawful wife and son." Sarah wanted Abraham to cast out Hagar and Ishmael; Abraham didn't want to do that, but God told Abraham

to obey Sarah. Luther comments:

Here Abraham is forced simply to give up his opinion and to cast out his son, whom he loved very much, together with his wife, of whom he was very fond. ... Abraham has very saintly thoughts, and his will is very upright; for he realizes that by divine and human right he is under obligation to his wife and son yet is compelled to cast out both; and there would have been no end to this conflict if God had not intervened.

In the continuing discussion Luther consistently refers to Hagar and Ishmael as Abraham's "wife and son." Luther did not enter into a discussion of the relationship between Sarah and Hagar; he simply spoke of Hagar as the wife of Abraham.

After the death of Sarah and the marriage of Isaac, "Abraham took a wife, and her name was Keturah," (25:1). In the geneology in 1 Chronicles 1:32, however, Keturah is called "Abraham's concubine." In Genesis 25 it is reported that Abraham made Isaac his heir, but that he gave gifts to the sons of the concubines. Who were these concubines? Since no other names are given, it appears that they were Hagar and Keturah. How were the terms "wife" and "concubine" used? Luther wrestled at length with this problem:

But why is Keturah called Abraham's wife in this passage, although it is stated later on that Abraham gave gifts to his concubines? Above there is a similar expression: "Sarah gave Hagar to Abram her husband as a wife" (Gen. 16:3). I am leaving the disputes about grammatical matters to the grammarians themselves. The Latins give the name *pellex* to a woman joined to a man who has a wife. They themselves had many *pellices*. A concubine is a woman whom an unmarried man has outside of wedlock, with whom he had intercourse. She is neither a *pellex* nor a wife. Augustine had such a concubine.

But the times change laws and customs. Therefore one should note how in this passage and before the Law of Moses these terms must be distinguished,

for there is a difference between wife and wife. Abraham never had two wives. Lamech (Gen. 4:19) was the first to marry two women. Of Abraham, however, it is stated that he had only one wife. Yet there were two.

The term "wife," in only one meaning and in only one way, is applied to a woman who is free and who bears the heir of all goods. Such a one is Sarah. In another way a female slave who bears a child, but not an heir, is improperly called a wife. Later on Moses changed everything. Jacob had four wives, and the two female slaves or maids also gave birth to heirs.

Here a woman who is free and bears children is properly called a wife. A slave woman who bears children but no heirs is also called a wife. Keturah is a wife. Nevertheless, she is a *pellex*, as is stated later in the text. And in I Chron. 1:32 the sons of Keturah, the פְּיִלְגֶשֶׁת of Abraham, that is, the concubine or *pellex* of Abraham, are enumerated. The Latin word is derived from the Hebrew. Thus the woman Keturah seems to have been a slave woman, because she is numbered among the concubines. She is not considered a lady of the house or as an heiress; she was taken only for the purpose of becoming the mother of offspring and bearing children. Such wives are not free or ladies of the house. (IV:306-307)

The same ambivalence in the use of the term "wife" is found in Luther's discussion of Jacob's case (Genesis 29-30). Jacob wanted only Rachal, but Laban deceived him by giving him Leah. He then gave Jacob Rachel also. To each of his daughters he gave a maid, both of whom became mothers of Jacob's children. So Jacob was a bigamist or, depending upon definitions, a polygamist. Luther:

Moses does not regard it as proper to call Leah a wife. No, he says: "He took his daughter Leah and brought her to Jacob." (V:297) For Leah is compelled by only one word and nod from her father Laban to take the place of Rachel and herself to become the bride even contrary to the plighted troth, (V:301). Therefore we shall reply to the proposed

question by saying that there was no marriage between Jacob and Leah, for the willing consent of both was lacking. (V:302) Thus this union of Jacob and Leah is not a marriage, and the deed *per se* is a defilement. But it is excused on the ground of invincible ignorance. (V:303)

Viewing the union from the viewpoint of the manner in which it was consummated, Luther judged it to be no marriage. But after it has been consummated, Luther judged it as follows:

But after his complaint there will be a true marriage when God grants a dispensation for this union and confirms it by giving offspring: Simeon, Levi, Reuben, etc. Then it must be called well done, in order that everything the saints do may work together for their good (cf. Rom. 8:28). Otherwise it is neither a marriage nor adultery; it is simply a monstrosity. (V:306) Now he has two wives. (V:306)

When Rachel could not conceive, she gave Jacob her maid, Bilhah. Subsequently, when Leah ceased conceiving, she gave Jacob her maid, Zilpah. Luther comments:

For Jacob marries two sisters and, in addition, two of their maidservants. Thus he is the husband of four wives. (V:322) ... beside the two sisters he also marries two maidservants. Although I make no positive statement, yet in that age it seems to have been the custom of that region for barren wives to hand their maidservants over to their husbands. Thus Laban adds a maidservant to both his daughters, perhaps to the end that in case the daughter did not give birth, the maidservant might take her place and that the house might be built from her. Thus above (cf. Gen. 16:2) Sarah gave a maidservant to Abraham, not a strange maid but one from her own house and domestics. Isaac did not follow this custom. Nor would Jacob have employed it if he had not been deceived by Laban and the women had not demanded it so emphatically. (V:324-325)

The household management of these people was

extraordinary. For we see that the women had the power to give their maidservants to their husbands and to take them away again. For after Rachel has given birth to Joseph, her first-born, she no longer grants her maidservant admittance to her husband. Nor does Leah do so after Gad and Asher have been born to her maidservant. From this it is evident how chaste they were. For Jacob was not permitted to lie with the maidservants to satisfy his lust, but only when his wives wanted and permitted it, which adulterers and fornicators are not wont to do. (V:340-341)

The Scriptural use of the terms "wife" and "concubine" are fluid. Thus Keturah is called both a wife and a concubine. The maids who were given to their husband by the wives were called neither wives nor concubines. They appear to be extensions of the bodies of the wives. When Jacob was determined to depart from Laban, he consulted with Rachel and Leah. When the time for action came, "Jacob rose up, and set his sons and his wives upon camels," (31:17). The sons evidently include also the sons of the handmaids, but there is a question as to whether "wives" included Bilhah and Zilpah. When Jacob prepared to meet Esau (Gen. 33), "he put the handmaids and their children foremost, and Leah and her children after, and Rachel and Joseph hindermost." Luther passes over the subtleties of the various terms and considers all mothers of children to be wives. Thus Abraham had three wives, Sarah and Hagar at the same time and Keturah after the death of Sarah but possibly while Hagar was still living. Jacob's case was more simple; he simply had four wives.

The motive for taking a second or more wives was not the gratification of lust, but the desire for children. The patriarchs and their wives took the command of God seriously, "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth," (Gen. 1:28). It was Luther's opinion that this was the dominant reason for Lamech's introducing bigamy. The desire for greater power through a larger family and the possibility that a plague may have decimated the population were secondary considerations. Sarah suggested that Abraham take her maid Hagar after ten fruitless

years had passed. From this example it seems that the Jews set ten years as the limit that a husband would wait for his wife to conceive. Thereafter he had the right to take a second wife. This may have been the situation in the case of Elkanah and Hannah. Luther:

The fact that Moses mentions the ten years — this the Jews bring into conformity with the rule and law that a husband should live with his wife for ten years, but that in case she remains childless for a decade, then it is right for the husband to take another wife, in order that he may not die without an heir. I do not know whether this law was observed or not. (III:46-47)

The practice of building a house by obtaining children by proxy through the wife's maid appears to have been common. The suggestion always came from the wife. Sarah urged Abraham to go in unto Hagar. Rachel offered Bilhah as a surrogate for herself, and later Leah gave Jacob Zilpah. The husbands did not take the initiative; neither did the maids have a voice or choice in the matter. Luther does not deny the existence of rivalry between Rachel and Leah, but he avers that their prime motivation was the desire for offspring, especially in view of the promise of the coming Blessed Offspring from the seed of their husbands. They want to be the Lord's instruments in fulfilling His promise of a Savior to come and so acted in faith. Of Sarah Luther wrote:

Even though Sarah sees that the fulfillment of the promise is being delayed and even though she despairs — both because of her barrenness and because of her age — of being a mother, she nevertheless relinquishes the glory of motherhood in the utmost humility and is content if her maid Hagar becomes pregnant by Abraham.

Therefore she holds fast to her faith and hope in the mercy of God. In the utmost humility she bears the disgrace of barrenness and willingly concedes this honor to her maid.

But Sarah distinguishes most beautifully among the gifts of God. Even though she is barren, she believes that He loves her. For this reason she

willingly concedes the glory of fertility to her maid. Thus the virtue of this woman is extraordinary in every respect.

... Sarah herself intends to remain the mother and the mistress in the household; she herself intends to have the promised Seed — if not the natural one, still the legal one.

Here too, the faith of this most saintly woman is shown. Sarah has her maid lie with Abraham in order that she, Sarah, may lay claim to the offspring as her own. She intends to be a mother legally, even though she cannot be a mother naturally. (III:44-45)

In connection with Gen. 30:3, when Rachel offers Jacob Bilhah, Luther comments:

"To bear upon the knees" is a Hebrew expression with which Rachel points out that she wants to become a mother, and with these words she adopts the offspring from her maidservant; for they indicate the duties of a mother, since a mother holds an infant on her knees. Thus it is stated in Is. 66:12: "You shall be dandled upon her knees." The mother has the child on her lap. Therefore she thought: "Though I cannot have a son from myself, yet I will become the mother of the Blessed Seed through my maidservant." From this one can see a most ardent desire for the Promised Seed, likewise the piety and ourstanding faith with which they clung to the promises concerning the Christ which had been made to Jacob. Furthermore, the women had to be endowed with remarkable probity, since they could be wives of such a poor man and serve in their father's house as maidservants. This was incomparable saintliness and wonderful faith, patience, hope, and love. The delicate daughters of our citizens or peasants could never have shown anything like this. (V:334)

When Leah ceased bearing, she gave Jacob her maid Zilpah, who bore Gad and Asher. In connection with the latter (Gen. 30:13), Luther comments as follows:

Zilpah bears a second son for Leah, and on him she again congratulates herself to an extraordinary

degree. For only offspring was sought. Accordingly, examples of chastity must be sought in this history, not examples of lust. Leah wishes to please her husband with her fertility, which is a most praiseworthy virtue in a wife who desires to dwell with her husband and not to follow a stranger, yes, to be anxious to please this husband alone, to have the favor of him alone, but especially such a great man, to whom the Savior of the world was promised. Therefore these are truly and most especially manifestations of marital love full of godliness, chastity, and obedience, not of lust, as the Roman sows and many of the fathers and monks have interpreted it. (V:351)

The question arises as to the morality of bigamy or polygamy in the Old Testament times. Were the patriarchs guilty of immoral conduct when they heeded their wives and took the maids of their wives as wives? Here are some of Luther's comments regarding the action of Abraham:

Abraham's virtuousness is also outstanding. Although he had the right to take another woman, as was customary — for at that time polygamy was in vogue — yet he does this only at the urging of his wife. (III:45)

... the Old Testament permitted polygamy also for the sake of children, and in Moses there is a law which states that if anyone has ravished a maid, he must keep her as his wife (Deut. 22:29). But regulations concerning ceremonial or legal matters have come to an end, and Abraham's case is far different from the one which appears in Moses. (III:46)

... why should the Jews use Abraham's example to justify polygamy, when this practice was commanded in the Law (Deut. 25:5)? For the widow of a brother who died without children had to become the wife of her deceased husband's brother, in order that the latter might bring forth offspring for him who had died.

When we reflect on this command, we commonly assent to the opinion that much license was given to sexual lust among the Jews, since polygamy was not

only permitted but even commanded. (III:47)

These sample quotations reflect the entire flow of Luther's thought. There is no hint of moral indictment of the patriarchs for taking or having more than one wife. But at the same time Luther vigorously denies anyone the right of using the practice of the patriarchs as a norm for New Testament living. Concerning the case of Abraham's taking Hagar at the request of Sarah, Luther wrote:

But this case should not be set up as a pattern, as though we were allowed to do the same things; for it is necessary to consider the circumstances. The promise of the Seed has not been made to us, as it was to Abraham; and no matter if your marriage is completely barren, there is no danger whatever from this source, even if your entire lineage should die out if God so will.

Abraham, however, not only had the promise of the Seed, but it was also an assured fact that Sarah was barren.

These circumstances do not exist in your case. Therefore this unusual action of these spouses should in no wise be adduced as a pattern, especially not in the New Testament. (III:45-46)

Jacob took Rachel as his wife a week after he had received Leah. Luther referred to the subsequent Mosaic law, which prohibited the marrying of sisters (Lev. 18:18), and commented as follows:

... Therefore this example should not be taken as a precedent: Jacob keeps Leah and regards her as his lawful wife, although he would have been glad to forsake her. For the law and custom of the fatherland stood in the way. Then, too, there was the defilement that had been committed. But because Jacob consents he begins to be guilty and by his consent to confirm the crime. What, then, shall we say?

I reply: Some examples are heroic; others pertain to customs. Laws and customs must simply be observed, and no transgression should be tolerated, lest confusion arise. The heroic examples are those that do not agree with the laws. For it often hap-

pens that a heroic man, whom God has endowed with special power, bursts through and breaks the rule but does not leave an example behind him. Customs, laws, and rights should be observed and examples should be followed. But in the case of heroic men there is no precedent. No example is valid unless it is similar in all respects. If you are similar to Jacob, and if such a case, such an occasion and necessity arises, then you will be permitted to do what Jacob was permitted to do. If you are not similar to Jacob in all respects, you will have to adhere to the law and the common customs.

One must not burst through rashly and set an example and a precedent because of some heroic case. (V:307-308)

Observe that Luther introduces the category of heroic men whose position in life places them in a category of their own. Their lifestyle is not to be imitated by the common man. Luther cites the case of Muenzer, who wanted to play the role of a David. But nowhere does Luther permit the examples of the patriarchs to be taken as precedents for New Testament marriages. To New Testament believers Luther would say, "But remember that you must abide by this rule: 'Each man should have his own wife' (1 Cor. 7:2)" (V:325-326)

SUMMARY 1. Terminology: The distinction between a wife and a concubine in Biblical usage appears to be fluid rather than sharply defined. Thus Keturah is called a wife of Abraham in Gen. 25:1, but appears to be referred to as a concubine in the sixth verse of that same chapter and is called a concubine in the genealogical table in 1 Chron. 1:32. The maids of wives, who became mothers of children by the husbands of the wives, were not granted the honor of being called wives. They remain maids, subject to their mistresses in general, but especially in regard to conjugal relations with the husbands of their mistresses. That Jacob set his sons and "wives" on camels (Gen. 31:17) either refers exclusively to Rachel and Leah or to Bilhah and Zilpah in an improper sense. Luther first defined a wife as a free woman who became the mother of the heir. That definition fit Sarah, but failed in the case of Jacob because

both Rachel and Leah and also their maids became mothers of the heads of the twelve tribes of Israel. Luther's practical solution of the problem was to consider the women who became mothers to be the wives of the man in question, regardless of whether the woman was technically the wife, handmaid, or concubine.

2. Motivation: The fall into sin added a new dimension to marriage, making it "a medicine against the sin of fornication." Luther never underestimated the power of lust, but nonetheless he believed Lamech's introduction of bigamy to have been chiefly motivated by a desire to obey the command of the Lord God to "be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth," (Gen. 1:28). In the cases of Abraham and Jacob obedience to this command was reinforced by faith in the promise of the Blessed Seed who was to come from their seed. In both cases it was the legitimate wives who urged their husbands to take their maids to bed. Luther does not overlook the rivalry in the family of Jacob between Rachel and Leah, but he does insist that the action of these pious women was primarily motivated, as in the case of Sarah, by faith in the promise of the Savior. These women wanted to be instruments in the hand of the Lord in fulfilling His promise of the One who would bring blessing to all families on earth.

3. Ethical Status of Bigamy and Polygamy in the Old Testament: Luther did not consider the bigamy and polygamy of the patriarchs immoral or unethical. He spoke of Abraham's taking Hagar as following the "customs" of the time. Polygamy was "in vogue," "was not only permitted but even commanded in the Old Testament." (Cf. the levirate marriage, Deut. 25:5-10; the case of rape, Deut. 22:29; the regulations regarding a daughter given to another as a maid to be a wife, Ex. 21:7-10; and the protection of the inheritance rights of the son of a hated wife, Deut. 21:15-17.) Luther's condoning of bigamy or polygamy in Old Testament times, or perhaps better, his lack of disapproval, stems from his deep respect for the creation ordinance of procreation (Gen. 1:28). He did not seek to reconcile this ordinance of procreation with the ordinance of marriage as a monogamic institution to fulfill the procreative mandate. Later Lutheran theolo-

gians sought to make such a reconciliation by using a variety of terms such as "dispensation," "permission," and "toleration" when evaluating the moral status of polygamy among the Old Testament believers. (Cf. Martin Chemnitz, *Examination of the Council of Trent*, Part II, pp. 730-731.) The fact of the matter is that our God has not revealed to us a complete understanding of His ways with men.

4. Form of Marriage in the New Testament: Luther consistently denied to anyone the prerogative of using the cases of the patriarchs as precedents for marriage practices in the New Testament times. Abraham and Jacob were in a class by themselves. Offspring were necessary for the fulfillment of the promises. That does not apply to New Testament believers. Luther operated with the category of heroic men (*Helden*) who at a given time and place in Kingdom history were obligated to do what the ordinary believer has no right to imitate, e.g., the necessity for propagating on the part of the patriarchs in the interest of the Promise, Abraham's killing his son in response to God's command, or David slaughtering thousands in accordance with his office. Luther did not look upon monogamy as unknown to the Old Testament saints or as an institution subsequently revealed and made normative in the New Testament by our Lord (Matt. 19:3-8; Mark 10:2-9), but rather upon polygamy as an exception necessitated by singular circumstances. Luther always held the customs and laws of a nation in high regard. His concern was always social peace, order, and stability. For the same reason he was unalterably opposed to divorce. This led him into counseling difficulties in the cases of Henry VIII and Philip of Hesse. What Luther's counsel would have been regarding polygamy in a society in New Testament times, where polygamy is sanctioned both by custom and law of long standing, is conjecture.

Paul F. Nolting

BOOK REVIEW

Church Fellowship — What Does the Bible Say?, by Seth Erlandsson, translated by S. W. Becker. Northwestern Publishing House, 1979. Paper. 55 pages.

This booklet was written with the prayer that it "will open many eyes to the biblical and Lutheran doctrine concerning church fellowship — to the destruction of ecumenism and false doctrine — to advance biblical faith, doctrine and confession" (Foreword). It is surely hoped by its author, a spokesman for the *Biblicum* group of Swedish Lutherans with whom the Wisconsin Ev. Lutheran Synod is associated, that his words may still in these latter days have some beneficial effect in combating the sinful unionism involved in the common worship and joint celebration of the Lord's Supper that goes on in worldwide ecumenical meetings on the part of churches of a wide variety of doctrinal persuasion. He speaks in a sympathetic way of those who, though they "still want to be biblically faithful and Lutheran," have been led away from the "truth which they would confess, if only they would have the opportunity to get to know it." In spite of this rather subjective judgment, the author appears to be completely sincere in his desire to meet the needs of such people: "Those who hunger for the biblical doctrine, those who want to be Lutheran also in the doctrine of the church and church fellowship, shall here be satisfied with biblical advice — not with church politics or tactical speculations."

In our review of the booklet, we shall note that the author has, in the last sentence quoted, outlined the two chief parts of his presentation: (1) The teachings of Scripture on church and church fellowship, including discussions of fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines, altar and prayer fellowship; and (2) Obstacles to a proper Scriptural confession of these teachings in Sweden today. The first section consists of the first forty-two pages, Chapters I through VII. The second part consists of the last two chapters — Chapter VIII, "Obstacles to a

Biblical Confession," and Chapter IX, "Conclusion."

Chapter I, titled "The Teaching of the Bible Concerning Church Fellowship," is, according to the author's footnote, based on a summary by Prof. Theodore Aaberg of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod (ELS) published in *Lutheran Synod Quarterly*, Winter 1976-77, pp. 1-42. According to the booklet, Prof. Aaberg's presentation begins to describe the Church by first of all describing the Saint, since the Church is the communion of saints. Thus one begins with the sinner and points out how he, by the Holy Spirit's working through the Means of Grace, is converted to a believing child of God. We are reminded that "Only God's pure Word and sacraments are means of grace and only they can produce, nourish and preserve faith." (Emphasis in the original.)

Not only, then, does such a believer have the constant companionship of the Savior, but he also is changed from a stranger to a fellow-citizen with all other believers in the Kingdom of God. A Spirit-created unity is established. This is not a mere Platonic ideal, however. It exists as a reality. The Church has its marks, which can be distinguished — they are God's pure Word and Sacraments. And even though hypocrites may also join among those who gather about the marks of the Church, it will ever remain true that the Church, in the proper sense of the term, consists of the true believers (and only them) who have been converted and brought to faith by the Gospel. The external or visible assemblies of confessing Christians have the privilege of being called the Church because of the true believers in such assemblies.

The basis for recognition of fellow believers cannot be the *fides qua*, the faith which we believe or which is present in the heart, since this is invisible to the eyes of man. Rather, the only basis for such recognition must be the *fides quae*, that which one professes, that is, the doctrine, the objective truth of God's Word. Not only the Scriptures, but also the Lutheran Confessions establish this as an essential teaching on the practice of church fellowship, and Prof. Aaberg's article adduces the well-known passages from both with adequate introduction and explanation. Suffice it to say that the article

certainly makes clear that "agreement in the biblical doctrine is a presupposition for recognition and practicing church fellowship." And, a paragraph or so later, it emphasizes that Biblical doctrine "includes the whole Old Testament, for Jesus himself pointed to the Old Testament as God's Word and said, 'Scripture cannot be broken' (Jn. 10:35). It includes also everything that Christ himself taught, as well as everything taught by his disciples. In a word, everything in the Old and New Testaments is the doctrine of Christ."

Chapter II of the booklet under discussion consists of what the author describes as a "free summary" of the first part of C. F. W. Walther's work titled: *Die Stimme unserer Kirche in der Frage von Kirche und Amt* (Church and Ministry). This first part deals with the Church and is generally known as Walther's "Nine Theses on the Church." It would be possible to give a high recommendation of the booklet before us on the basis of this chapter alone, for it is a handy summary of Walther's presentation to have at hand, consisting as it does of each of the theses printed out, with summaries following of the proof from the Scriptures, then of statements from the Lutheran Confessions, and finally of works authored by orthodox teachers.

Chapter III is titled, "Another Summary of the Bible Doctrine," and presents, as we are informed in the footnote, the doctrinal position of the WELS. The reader is referred to the *Doctrinal Statements of the WELS*, published in 1970 by Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. No doubt this chapter is captioned as it is because in many ways it merely restates what has been written in the previous two chapters. In the main, one can find no basis for disagreement with this statement of the teachings of the WELS on church fellowship, as far as it goes. It makes many fine comments, such as, for example: "Only on the basis of the confession, which individuals or groups actually confess, do we know with whom we can practice church fellowship and give expression of a common faith. ... If there arise a contradiction between confession in word and confession in action, it is the confession in action that must be given greater credence. For that speaks louder than words." We al-

so appreciate the following: "What is the nature of the confession we seek as a basis for the exercise of church fellowship by which we give expression to our Christian fellowship of faith? Answer: A Christian confession of faith is in principle always a confession of everything in God's Word. Denial, corruption, or omission of any of God's Word is not a fruit of faith but of unbelief." Also, we are grateful for the clear statement by the WELS that although many imperfections may appear in a Christian group or congregation which in themselves may not necessarily disrupt the fellowship, particularly if held by weak Christians, yet "imperfections in the Christian congregation may never be used as justification for the idea that sin must be tolerated or that room must be given to departures from God's Word. No, the biblical truths must be taught purely everywhere in the church."

In the WELS presentation in regard to weak Christians, it is pointed out that one can become "infected with false doctrine" as a result of weakness in one's understanding of Biblical truths. Before this statement we note the observation that "Weak brothers distinguish themselves from mockers and unbelievers in their willingness to accept spiritual help and instruction." Here we should like to comment that this would be a better statement if it had also distinguished the weak Christian from a false teacher, and not merely from mockers and unbelievers. Also, it would have been more to the point in view of our present controversy to note that a weak Christian is not one who teaches or supports contrary doctrine, but, rather, one who wishes to be taught. At least here the WELS statement is correct: "He who will not accept advice and instruction is not a weak brother."

In several places in the WELS presentation the expression, "in spite of all brotherly admonition," is used to identify the ones who are to be avoided on the basis of Romans 16:17-18. For example: "We cannot continue to recognize as a Christian brother anyone who in spite of all brotherly admonition does not repent but defends sin." Or "We can no longer recognize as Christian brothers those who in spite of admonition hold to some sin in word or deed and who seek recognition for their sin and promote it." The first of these examples is in regard to

"Those who defend their own sin," and the second refers to "Those who spread sin." Thus the WELS wants to use the expression ("in spite of admonition") in regard to false teachers. We look in vain, however, for the expression in the third section, which deals with "Those who are in fellowship with false prophets."

We surely do not want to read thoughts into phrases which are not intended by the authors, but in view of the past statements accepted by the WELS that "termination of fellowship is called for when you have reached the conviction that admonition is of no further avail," one cannot help wondering if that is not what is still meant by the repeated emphasis on "in spite of admonition." The CLC has never ruled out the proper use of admonition in regard to the former brother who has become a causer of divisions and offenses, but has maintained that the very act of avoiding is in itself a powerful admonition, and continued admonition beyond that may certainly be carried on while refraining from the practice of fellowship. If admonition would ever of itself merely serve as justification for continued practice of fellowship with an individual or church body that has been recognized as causing divisions and offenses, that would, of course, be wrong.

The booklet under consideration does not enter into a discussion of this difference existing between the WELS and the CLC. One can surely understand why not, when one considers the author's purpose. And yet it is incorrect to assume, as the booklet appears to do (at least by omission), that there is no difference.*

Chapter IV, titled "Two Witnesses," quotes Paragraph 28, on Church Fellowship, of the Brief Statement of 1932 of the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod, and also Paragraphs 18 through 28 of "Concerning Church Fellowship," the document which was not only issued by our own Church

* Cf. *Journal of Theology*, Vol. 12, No. 4 (Dec., 1972), Pp. 36-39; and Vol. 17, No. 4 (Dec., 1977), Pp. 32-41, for detailed presentations of the difference between the WELS and the CLC.

of the Lutheran Confession (CLC) but was adopted as a part of its confessional basis in its formation as a church body. (These particular paragraphs also do not address themselves specifically to the division between the CLC and the WELS, although the document elsewhere certainly takes up the matter and presents our convictions.) CLC members in particular will be interested to note Dr. Erlandsson's comment on "Concerning Church Fellowship." After noting that it was translated into Swedish in 1973 by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Sweden, he writes: "It is noteworthy that it is being distributed by Pro Veritate Book Publishers, Uppsala, even though the directors of this publishing concern practice the unbiblical doctrine which is exposed and combated by this document."

Chapter V presents a concise and well-written presentation on "Fundamental and Non-Fundamental Doctrines." It consists almost entirely of gleanings from the writings of Walther and Pieper which point out the incorrectness of the opinion that "agreement in the fundamental doctrines is sufficient for Christian unity and church fellowship, but that there is no need to be in agreement in regard to the biblical doctrines which are non-fundamental."

The last two chapters of the first section deal with "Altar Fellowship" (Chapter VI) and "Prayer Fellowship" (Chapter VII). Suffice it to say that it is this reviewer's opinion that these chapters are extremely well-done. They are a concise synthesis of what has been said and written on the subject by Walther, Pieper, Hoenecke, and others. Because they say what Scripture says, their words are delightful to read again. We quote the following summary: "Fellowship in worship, pulpit fellowship, altar fellowship, prayer fellowship, etc., all these are a visible expression of one and the same faith. It is not true that pulpit fellowship and altar fellowship require a higher degree of unity than prayer fellowship. They are all expressions of one and the same faith, of a church fellowship which is based on the same faith, doctrine and confession. Such a fellowship is a gift and a creation of the Holy Ghost." This has been termed the "unit concept," and it is certainly Scriptural.

American readers of the booklet will find the last two chapters of particular interest. They present to those who may not have been aware of the situation in Sweden (and, very likely, throughout Europe) just what the "Obstacles to a Biblical Confession" are. The first such obstacle is "a high-church view of the Church." By this is meant "the idea that the church of Christ is bound to a certain outward form and its bishops, that the right and duty to administer the Word and the sacraments (the office of the keys) have been committed to a definite class of men (namely the bishops and their assistants, the pastors) and not to the whole church (= the believers)." "Just as men were bound in Old Testament times to the Levitical temple service, so, it is supposed, Christians are bound to the episcopal office and to the administration of the sacraments that is carried out at their command." Even though faithful Christians may desire to break fellowship with their church when it becomes heterodox, or when it refuses to break fellowship with errorists, they dare not, for the reason that if they do, they are separating themselves from the only proper dispensers of the Means of Grace, namely the bishops! "It binds grace and the means of grace not to God's pure Word but to those who hold offices in the church," and thus it leads to the "conclusion that one cannot separate from their" (the bishops') "administration of the office without excluding oneself from grace, and from the church of Christ."

Another obstacle discussed is termed "the heritage of the fathers." By this is meant, to begin with, that under Swedish law the state church was the Lutheran Church, and that, therefore, "no church fellowship outside the state church could legally be called biblical-Lutheran." After 1952, when the law was changed, a number of free organizations arose which thought that their chief function might be to supply the biblical-Lutheran doctrines where, in many points, the state church had surrendered them. Gradually these organizations rose in prominence and importance to the point where they became entrenched and became the "fathers." Once they have become so deeply entrenched, they have become the establishment, and they cannot be easily dislodged from their position of influence. The outcome is described rather

vividly: "The leaders of the free organizations therefore often became zealous supporters of the state church and opponents of a free Lutheran confessional church ..." In addition, there are certain "practical difficulties" to be faced in Sweden. One cannot help being impressed with the clear way in which these are described and illustrated.

Some of the difficulties have led to troubles and even separations within the "Biblicum group" itself. Dr. Erlandsson comments: "The grief over this is great, but it has not, thanks to God's incomprehensible grace and assistance, led to a change in course, so that human ideas should in certain situations be given precedence over God's Word." The final paragraphs of the booklet are, in general, optimistic and may be summed up in the author's words: "It is our hope and prayer to God that our friends inside the Scandinavian churches, who want to confess the biblical-Lutheran doctrine in all things, will not reject the biblical-Lutheran doctrine of church fellowship. We know that the temptation to do this is great because of the practical difficulties which can pile up when one not only in word but also in deed confesses this doctrine. But God's Word has the power to tear down the false defenses and to build up a courageous confession of everything in His Word."

John Lau

BOOK NOTICE

No Other Gospel, edited by Arnold J. Koelpin. Northwestern Publishing House, 1980. 367 pp. \$12.95

In order that the readers of the *Journal of Theology* may be promptly informed of the publication of a collection of commemorative essays in observance of the 400th anniversary of the Formula of Concord and the Book of Concord, we are providing this notice before having had the opportunity to review the book. The collection of essays was arranged by a Wisconsin Synod committee and centers specifically on the Formula of Concord and its

several articles. The authors are in the main professors at WELS educational institutions, with the exception of two from the Missouri Synod, one from Oberursel, West Germany, one from Uppsala, Sweden, and one from the ELS. We are informed in the preface that the Aid Association for Lutherans (a fraternal insurance company which furnishes funds for charitable and church work throughout the Lutheran world) helped make the publication a reality by a generous grant. We may say in passing that the A.A.L. made a similar offer to our CLC, but it was declined by our president because of the unionistic character of this pan-Lutheran organization.

In order that prospective buyers may know what the contents of the book are, we give the essay titles: 1. The Contemporary Significance of the Formula of Concord; 2. The Formula of Concord in the History of German Lutheranism; 3. The Formula of Concord in the History of Swedish Lutheranism; 4. The Formula of Concord in the History of American Lutheranism; 5. On Original Sin, the Flacian Aberration (FC, I); 6. On Justification, Osian-der's Doctrine of the Indwelling Christ (FC, III); 7. On Law and Gospel, Melancthon and *Lex Naturalis* (FC, IV,V); 8. On the Third Use of the Law (FC, VI); 9. On Christology, Brenz and the Question of Ubiquity (FC, VII,VIII); 10. On Baptism, the Challenge of Anabaptist Baptism and the Lutheran Confession (FC, XII); 11. The Continuity of the Formula of Concord with the Ancient Church; and 12. The Hermeneutics of the Formula of Concord. The book may be purchased through our CLC Book House.

C. M. Gullerud



6.

11

11

JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY
CHURCH OF THE LUTHERAN CONFESSION
IMMANUEL LUTHERAN COLLEGE

West Grover Road
EAU CLAIRE, WISCONSIN 54701

★
Forwarding Postage Guaranteed
Address Correction Requested

Postmaster: Send notice on Form 3579
to: Journal of Theology, 2750 Oxford
Street N., Roseville, MN 55113.

U. S. POSTAGE
Permit No. 34

PAID

EAU CLAIRE, WIS.
Non-Profit
Organization

