



"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 22

SEPTEMBER 1982

NUMBER 3

ISSN 0361-1906

CONTENTS

ABBA 2
John Pfeiffer

PAGING THROUGH THE QUARTALSCHRIFT (Concluded) 12
R. E. Wehrwein

PRIVATE EDUCATION AND THE LAW 15
James Sydow

OPENING ADDRESS AT ILC 36
Gordon Radtke

BOOK REVIEW: *Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties* 38
David Lau

BOOK NOTICES: *New King James Version, 2 from NWP* 42
C. M. Gullerud

The JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY is published at Immanuel Lutheran College, 501 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.
Molting, L. D. Redlin, John
Pfeiffer.

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.

ABBA

"Ba-ba-ba-ba." The infant utters his first syllables. Taking the cue, many Christian parents begin to direct the lips of their children toward God. Slowly, but surely, the infant learns to repeat the simple prayer, "Abba. Amen."¹

How fitting that our Lord should include the precious "Abba" in our spiritual vocabulary. It is a name which can be spoken by the smallest of God's lambs and can bring comfort to the oldest of His sheep. It is a name that can be heard from the cradle to the death-bed.

Our appreciation of "Abba," as a way of addressing God, begins with that infant's first syllables. The child's concept of a father is not complicated.² He sees his father as his faithful benefactor. He places an unreasoning trust in his father, unless the father should give him some reason not to trust.

Thus the term "Abba" denotes, first of all, an unreasoning, childlike trust in the person so addressed. Whoever looks to God and says, "Abba," is saying, "I trust You. Take me up in your strong arms; I shall not fear. You will not let me fall. You shall carry me wherever I need to go. Whatever You do with me, I know it shall be right. You are my 'Abba.'"

How is such a wonderful relationship established? It is obvious that man does not naturally see God with such unreasoning trust. One need only examine the nature of the gods which man has developed from his own imagination. The gods of the heathen are fickle. They do not possess the compassion of an Abba. The only reaction that the heathen can have toward their god is one of fear and distrust.

It is impossible to determine whether or not Adam and Eve viewed God as Abba in the pre-sinful world. However, in the post-sinful world they obviously did not. They saw Him only as an angry Judge, which, indeed, He

had become for them.

The presence of sin always nullifies the Abba-relationship. The world would like to believe in the "fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man." They would like to imagine God as some kind of kindly old grandfather, who chuckles at man's wickedness, as though man were performing harmless, boyish pranks. What the world likes and what the truth is are two entirely different things. On Judgment Day they shall not find God chuckling, unless it be "the last laugh" of one who vindicates himself (cf. Ps. 2:4).

How then can the angry frown of the Judge melt into the compassionate smile of the Father? Can man make such a change within himself as would alter his status before God? Not only is he unable to make a change, but he is also unwilling to do so. He does not want God as his Father. Nothing but hostility toward God exists in the heart of man (Rom. 8:7-8). Man is content to be a child of Satan (Jn. 8:44; I Jn. 3:8) and to perform the works of darkness (Jn. 3:19-20). Any change that takes place is not wrought by man.

The only way that a change could take place is if God Himself would do it. But why would God want to become a Father to wicked and rebellious sinners? Ask a cobra to be father to a mongoose; it would make more sense. There is nothing in man worth the labor of pater-nity. It is only in God that we find the cause: irrepressible love. His heart burns with the desire to hear the word "Abba" coming from the lips of His creatures. Yet He cannot hear it, unless He Himself makes a profound change in man. The Holy can be Father only to the holy.

Therefore, in love God determined to make that change at all costs, and the cost was dear. In order to take the Abba stance with man, God had to take the Judge's stance with the only One, Who had the "natural" right to call Him "Abba."

It began in a manner incomprehensible to the human mind. "When the fulness of the time came, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under law, in order that

He might redeem those who were under the law, that we might receive the adoption as sons," (Gal. 4:4f.). The "natural" relationship of God to His Son involved no judgment of any kind. Judgment comes only in connection with law. The Son was above all law. Therefore, the Son voluntarily placed Himself under the Law. He became a man and humbled Himself, emptying Himself and taking upon Himself the obligations and responsibilities of a slave.

As a human being, Jesus had to earn the right to call God "Abba." So long as He remained obedient to the Law, He had that right.³ If only once sin entered His life, He would have lost that right. Throughout His life, He did remain obedient. Twice during His humiliation God made the declaration that this was His beloved Son, in Whom He was well-pleased (Mk. 1:11; Mt. 17:5). As Judge, God was declaring that this human was worthy to call Him "Abba."

When Jesus addressed God as "Abba," we may be sure that it was more than lip-service and even more than the use of a title. Jesus was declaring a relationship, one which He had not only by virtue of His divinity, but also by virtue of His holiness as a human. Jesus had a perfect filial confidence in His Father. "Thou art he, who didst bring me forth from the womb; thou didst make me trust when upon my mother's breasts. Upon thee I was cast from birth; thou hast been my God from my mother's womb," (Ps. 22:9f.).

In the Garden of Gethsemane, Jesus feels most intensely the need for His Abba. His anticipation of the cross, the burden of sin, and the agony of hell become a crushing weight upon His soul. Out of deep grief He cries, "Abba! Father! All things are possible for thee; remove this cup from me; yet not what I will, but what thou wilt," (Mk. 14:36).⁴ With the name "Abba," Jesus shows His childlike confidence in God. The expression is a fitting companion to His subsequent words of submission. His position is that of a Son, and He is determined to keep that position. The fact that He does so is seen in His words as He leaves Gethsemane: "The cup which the Father has given me, shall I not drink it?" (Jn. 18:11). The dutiful Son accepts the Father's will.

From Gethsemane to Calvary, Jesus makes no specific reference to the Father, as such. However, once upon the cross, the Son looks heavenward in intercessory prayer: "Father, forgive them; for they do not know what they are doing."

As His suffering reaches its climax, a dramatic change takes place. The Father-Son relationship gives way to the Judge-slave relationship. During those three dark hours, man's Substitute stands before man's Judge. No longer do we hear "Abba," but now it is "Eli."⁵ The sin-laden Jesus is answering to the great Elohim for all the guilt of the world. A dumbfounding separation occurs, which can only be explained by the fact that the Guiltless became the Guilty.

Once the climax had passed and the vicarious atonement had been "finished" (Jn. 20:30), the Father-Son relationship returns: "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit," (Lk. 23:46). In the face of physical death, the filial confidence of Jesus is His stay.

This very shift from "Abba" to "Elohim" and back to "Abba" speaks to us of redemption accomplished. The Judge is forever propitiated. Had Jesus' sacrifice been incomplete, He could not have returned to calling God "Abba," for sin would have remained clinging to Him and God would have remained His Judge.

It is finished! God had carried out His loving purpose. His desire to hear the word "Abba" from His creatures had moved Him to pay the full price by Himself. He took the Judge's stance toward His only begotten Son. He turned His angry frown away from sinners and toward our dear Savior. — Praise be to His glorious name! — The status of sinners has been changed. The way is open for man to cry out, "Abba! Father!"

Yet, man still refused to approach God in this manner. Though God had reconciled the world to Himself, man was not reconciled within himself. His status was changed, but he remained the same. Though it was possible for God to turn a Father's heart to man, it was not possible for man to turn a child's heart to God.

It remained for the Spirit to do His work. On the wings of the Gospel of reconciliation, the Spirit made His swift flight through the world. Out of the mouth, through the ear, and into the heart went the Word of the Spirit, and He with it. Suddenly, voices were being heard from every nation in every tongue, crying, "Abba!" A people, who had formerly feared and mistrusted the great Elohim, now saw God in a new light. They saw Him as their Abba. The precious Hebrew word first spoken by the fleshly sons of Abraham was now upon the lips of men of every nationality. "From the Father the whole family in heaven and on earth derives its name," (Eph. 3:15).

Who were these voices? What had happened? These were they, who had "received the spirit of adoption as sons by which we cry out, 'Abba! Father!'" It was not the same old man who raised his voice to God, but a new man, born of the Spirit. The Spirit had done all the work within man. Man had done nothing. "As many as received Him, to them He gave the right to become children of God, even to those who believe in His name, who were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God," (Jn. 1:12f.). The Spirit found the prodigal wallowing in the pig pen of sin and directed his heart to the Father. Only thus was the prodigal able to lift himself out of the mire and call out, "Father, I have sinned." Though the prodigal did not regard himself worthy of full sonship, yet the Father reached out loving arms and embraced this newly reborn son. "See how great a love the Father has bestowed upon us, that we should be called children of God; and such we are," (I Jn. 3:1).

Those who imagine that there is some other way to gain access to the Father shall have a rude awakening on Judgment Day. Jesus says, "No one comes to the Father, but through me," (Jn. 14:6). The Spirit says, "Through Him we both have access in one spirit to the Father," (Eph. 2:18). There is no other way.

For those who have been led by the Spirit of God to see God as their Abba in Christ Jesus, Judgment Day will prove them to be true children of God, for only the child can inherit the possession of the Father. "You have re-

ceived the spirit of adoption as sons by which we cry out, 'Abba! Father!' The Spirit himself bears witness with our spirit that we are children of God, and if children, heirs also, heirs of God and fellow-heirs with Christ ..." (Rom. 8:15-17).

Before these new-borns can take their first step in the ways of God, they stand in unrestrained awe of what God has become for them. Just as He laid aside the Abba stance, in order to assume the Judge's stance toward His Son, even so He has laid aside the Judge's stance, in order to assume the Abba stance toward the born-again sinner.

"Just as a father has compassion on his children, so the Lord has compassion on those who fear Him," (Ps. 103:13). A judge must judge without pity (Deut. 13:8; 19:13, 21), and only in strict accord with the law. But a father pities his children. He recognizes that they are weak and given to foolishness. God is an Abba to us. In our weakness and foolishness, we can cry out, "Abba," and we know that He will look upon us with compassion. He will gather us into His arms and say, "Take courage; my son, your sins are forgiven," (Mt. 9:2).⁶ Surely, He is the "Father of all mercies and the God of all comfort," (II Cor. 1:3).

This, however, does not mean that His paternal care consists only in one compassionate smile after another. While a father pities his weak and foolish child, he also wishes to give him strength and wisdom. Our dear Abba has the same desire for us. Our cry of "Abba" is heard by Him not only as a prayer for pity, but also one for fatherly guidance and strength. "With weeping they shall come, and by supplication I will lead them; I will make them walk by streams of waters, on a straight path in which they shall not stumble; for I am a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my first-born," (Jer. 31:9).

By the Word of power, Abba takes us by the hand and leads us. He shows us where to place each foot as we take our faltering infant steps. He fills us with strength to continue on our course. This process of teaching foolish children involves discipline, also. Until wisdom is

perfect, foolishness will be present and the child will be apt to stray. "My son, do not reject the discipline of the Lord, or loathe His reproof; for whom the Lord loves He reproveth, even as a father, the son in whom he delights," (Prov. 3:11f.; cf. Heb. 12:5ff.). The mental pain of admonition, the physical pain, which comes as a direct consequence of sin (e.g., drunkenness: hangover), the pain of persecution, and every other pain that enters the life of God's children come from the hand of a loving Father. So long as we remember this, God's discipline will give its intended training, and "afterwards it yields the peaceful fruit of righteousness," (Heb. 12:11).

Were there no seducers along the way, weak and foolish children would not be in danger. But they are ever present: Satan, the world, and our flesh. With "candy" and the promises of "fun," they try to lure God's children into sin and unbelief.

However, our Abba is always watching over us. He sees the seducers and comes to our rescue. This He may do simply by hindering Satan and his helpers, as He did for His son, Job. He speaks to Satan as to Pharaoh, "Israel is my son, my first-born. So I said to you, 'Let my son go, that he may serve me,'" (Ex. 4:22f.). Therefore, whenever the reborn sinner feels the lure of temptation, he knows that he can cry out, "Abba!" and God will be there to rescue him.

Unfortunately, there are too many times when we do not cry out for help. Perhaps, like foolish children, we imagine ourselves to be stronger than our enemies. Perhaps we even fail to recognize them as enemies and imagine that they are friends. Perhaps we think that "one little sin" will not do great harm. So we slip and fall into temptation and a snare. Does our Abba forsake us? Thanks be to His loving-kindness, He does not! "When he falls, he shall not be hurled headlong; because the Lord is the one who holds his hand," (Ps. 37:24). What comfort to know that even when we sin, our Abba is still holding our hand. A "spank" of discipline, a word of admonition, an assurance of forgiveness, and we are rescued from the jaws of the lion. What security we have as children of the heavenly Father!

As Jesus promised, "No one is able to snatch them out of the Father's hand," (Jn. 10:29). He holds us in His hand. This is our confidence: the child's hand is always smaller than the father's. Thus, the child's security is not found when he holds his father's hand, but when his father is holding his. The larger hand around the smaller: therein is security. If we thought that we always had to reach up and grasp Abba's hand, we would feel most insecure. Praise be to God, for He always reaches down and grasps our hand!

Even so the newly reborn child of God sees the wonders of his Abba. Words fail to express the assurance, comfort, and security that he finds in this new relationship with Almighty God. Eternity cannot provide sufficient "time" to exhaust his songs of praise and thanksgiving.

The child of God does not stop with words. From the moment he is given to see God as Abba, his whole life changes. It is impossible for him to be a child in name only. The filial connection with God is a heart connection.

"If you address as Father the One who impartially judges according to each man's work, conduct your lives in fear during the time of your stay upon earth; knowing that you were not redeemed with perishable things like silver or gold from the futile way of life inherited from your forefathers, but with precious blood, as of a lamb unblemished and spotless, the blood of Christ," (I Pet. 1:17-19). There are many who invoke God by the name "Father," but who have neither the desire nor the intent to live as His children. For them the name "Father" is only a word devoid of meaning. They would take the word "Abba" as being only the Hebrew equivalent for the English "Father."

Before rebirth, we were a part of the world. We "walked according to the course of this world," (Eph. 2:2). But once the miracle took place, there occurred a separation. Such a separation from the world and the things of the world is understood by those who know the Father. "Do not love the world, nor the things in the world. If any-

one loves the world, the love of the Father is not in him," (I Jn. 2:15). "'Therefore, come out from their midst and be separate,' says the Lord, 'and do not touch what is unclean; and I will welcome you. And I will be a Father to you, and you shall be sons and daughters to me,' says the Lord Almighty," (II Cor. 6:17f.).

This separation is on the mind and heart of God's children throughout their lives. Never is it acceptable to allow some sin or some error to become a part of our lives, whether in thought, action, or teaching. How can a child cling to his Abba with one hand and cling to the enemies of the Father with the other? Whenever sin or error penetrate our lives, the Father removes them.

"When the fulness of the time came, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the Law, in order that He might redeem those who were under the Law, that we might receive the adoption as sons. And because you are sons, God has sent forth the spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, 'Abba! Father!'" Therefore you are no longer a slave, but a son; and if a son, then an heir through God," (Gal. 4:4-7). Thanks be to the great Elohim, Whose incomprehensible love caused Him to desire that sinners become His sons. He, Who is the Judge of all, is now seen and known by us as our dear Abba. Thanks be to the only begotten Son of God, Who willingly left the side of His Abba in heaven to place Himself under the Elohim on earth and to suffer divine wrath in our place. Thanks be to the Spirit, Who has entered our hearts, so that we could believe all this to be true.

Now we live in security, nestling in the loving arms of our Abba. In every time of need, we know that we can "with all boldness and confidence ask Him as dear children ask their dear Father," (Luther). When we sin, Abba is there to have pity on us and forgive us. When we suffer, Abba is there to soothe our wounds. When we sorrow, Abba is there to comfort us. When we die, Abba is there to carry us to our eternal inheritance.

God is our eternal and constant Abba. Every other אֱלֹהִים must leave us, but not this One. "For Thou art our Father, though Abraham does not know us, and Israel

does not recognize us. Thou art our Father, our Redeemer from of old is Thy name." From the cradle to the death-bed, each child of God can raise his voice and cry, "Abba!" No sweeter prayer can cross our lips. No greater security can possess our hearts than that which our hearts find in this name. Abba. Amen.

Children of the heavenly Father
Safely in His bosom gather.
Nestling bird nor star in heaven
Such a Refuge e'er was given.

To God all praise and glory.

John K. Pfeiffer

NOTES

1. The *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* states that אָבָא was derived from the babbling sounds of the infant (Vol. I, p. 1). As one who believes that God's providence extends also to languages, especially the languages of Scripture, I believe that the origin of this term is in God. It may be true that our Lord anticipated the labializing of infants. God fashioned a name for the lips of all, from infancy to old age.
2. A study of אָבָא issues in this simple definition: "the generator of a child, a family, or a movement." In the Old Testament society, the family, tribe, or clan was more important than city or nation. Thus the progenitor of a family was greatly revered. In him, a man could find his roots. Generations would cling to the אָבָא אָבָא. So long as the original אָבָא was living, he had almost unlimited authority. His seed looked to him as the center of family strength and will.
3. Just as the אָבָא אָבָא had almost unlimited authority, even so having God as Abba means submitting and honoring, as well as leaning on His strength.
4. By the Holy Spirit, Mark saw fit to record the Aramaic word of Jesus. Was it just for dramatic effect? I regard it as a way of showing Jesus' complete submission, His total acceptance of the filial position.
5. As far as I know, though Jesus often referred to God

as "God" when teaching, this is the only time that He ever addressed Him as "God" in prayer.

6. These are words of Jesus. I apply them to the Father only because Jesus said, "He who has seen me has seen the Father," (Jn. 14:9). In the area of compassion, as well as others, Jesus is a perfect reflection of the Father.

PAGING THROUGH THE QUARTALSCHRIFT

(Concluded)

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF TRANSLATED QUARTALSCHRIFT ARTICLES

II. Articles by J. P. Koehler translated in *Faith-Life*, the periodical of the Protes'tant Conference: (Continued)

26. "*Der Glaube, des Urwesens des Christenlebens auf der Erde*," QS, Vol. 24, No. 1 (January, 1927), pp. 1-59; Vol. 24, No. 2 (April, 1927), pp. 97-161; Vol. 24, No. 3 (July, 1927), pp. 193-244.

English translation (Emil John and Leigh Jordahl): "Faith, the Quintessence of Christian Life on Earth," FL, Vol. 21, Nos. 8-12 (August to December, 1948); Vol. 22, Nos. 1-6, 9, & 11 (January to June, September, and November, 1949).

Proceed to p. 1 of Vol. 27, No. 7 (July, 1954), for a note regarding resumption of the translation (Kurt Zorn): FL, Vol. 27, Nos. 7-9 & 11 (July to September and November, 1954); Vol. 28, Nos. 1 & 3-7 (January and March to July, 1955). The concluding "Notes" on p. 16 of the July, 1955, issue contain inaccuracies in the listing of the issues in which the translation of this article appeared.

III. Other items in *Faith-Life*:

1. W. Streiszguth, "*Das Evangelium tuts und tuts allein*," QS, Vol. 6, No. 4 (October, 1909), pp. 233-235.

English translation (Paul Hensel): "The Gospel Alone Does It," FL, Vol. 39, No. 2 (March/April, 1966), p. 21f.

2. Otto Hagedorn, "Die Freude im Heiligen Geist," QS, Vol. 18, No. 2 (April, 1921), pp. 81-94.

English translation (A. Erwin Wagner): "The Joy in the Holy Spirit," FL, Vol. 16, No. 7 (July, 1943), p. 1f. There is a separate English translation by Paul Hensel in Vol. 41, No. 3 (May/June, 1968), p. 5f.

3. Portions of A. Pieper's article of 1911, "*Menschenherrschaft in der Kirche*," are translated on pp. 7-8 of the supplement to Vol. 9, No. 4 (April, 1936). The translator (Henry Albrecht) reproduces portions from p. 33, p. 101, p. 111ff., and p. 122. Quotations in translation from A. Pieper's *Quartalschrift* writings are also found in the issues of May, 1952 (p. 14), and June, 1952 (p. 5f.).

4. An article by G. A. Zeisler giving an overview of J. P. Koehler's *Quartalschrift* writings appears in FL, Vol. 22, No. 10 (October, 1949), p. 4f. John Springer prepared a 12-page bibliography of the published works of J. P. Koehler which appeared as a supplement in FL, Vol. 44, No. 6 (November/December, 1971).

IV. Articles translated in the *Journal of Theology*:

1. A. Pieper, "Die rechte Scheidung von Gesetz und Evangelium in ihrer Bedeutung fuer reine Lehre und christliches Leben" (*Schluss*), QS, Vol. 7, No. 4 (October, 1910), pp. 280-300. The first two parts of this three-part article are to be found in the two immediately preceding issues. Only the third part was translated.

English translation (Waldemar Schuetze): "The Proper Separation of Law and Gospel in its Significance for Pure Doctrine and Christian Life," JT, Vol. 18, No. 4 (December, 1978), pp. 2-22.

2. J. Schaller, "Gottes Wille und Befehl," QS, Vol. 12, No. 1 (January, 1915), pp. 1-23.

English translation (Waldemar Schuetze and H. C. Duehlmeier): "God's Will and Command," JT, Vol. 19, No. 3 (September, 1979), pp. 16-40.

3. J. Schaller, "Das Reich Gottes," QS, Vol. 15, No. 2 (April, 1918), pp. 81-100; Vol. 15, No. 3 (July, 1918), pp. 153-174.

English translation (E. Schaller): "The Kingdom of God," JT, Vol. 1, No. 4 (October, 1961), pp. 13-26; Vol. 1, No. 5 (December, 1961), pp. 11-21; Vol. 2, No. 1 (February, 1962), pp. 13-26; Vol. 2, No. 2 (April, 1962), pp.

1-13.

4. A. Pieper, "*Gottes Gericht ueber den unuerdigen Genuss des heiligen Abendmahls*," QS, Vol. 28, No. 2 (April, 1931), pp. 81-104.

English translation (L. Grams): "God's Judgment upon the Unworthy Use of the Lord's Supper," JT, Vol. 9, No. 5 (December, 1969), pp. 1-26.

5. E. E. Kowalke, "*Das erste Gebot*," QS, Vol. 28, No. 2 (April, 1931), pp. 104-114.

English translation (Robert Dommer): "Does the First Commandment Demand Justifying Faith?", JT, Vol. 21, No. 1 (March, 1981), pp. 10-20. The footnote on p. 10 fails to take note of the fact that this writing, originally a conference paper, was published in the *Quartalschrift*.

6. A. Pieper, "*Zum Verstaendnis der Bergpredigt*," QS, Vol. 34, No. 1 (January, 1937), pp. 1-16.

English translation (Waldemar Schuetze): "A Proper Understanding of the Sermon on the Mount," JT, Vol. 19, No. 1 (March, 1979), pp. 22-37.

7. An article by Pastor F. B. Bernthal entitled, "*Ge hoeren die Worte der Verheissung im Schlusz der 10 Gebote in das Gesetz oder in das Evangelium?*", appeared in QS, Vol. 33, No. 4 (October, 1936), pp. 232-240. Its essential content, along with that of a somewhat longer article on the same subject by "G.A.M." in the 1895 *Lehre und Wehre* (July to October), is reproduced by E. Schaller in the *Journal of Theology*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (August, 1965), pp. 1-14: "Exodus 20:6 - Law or Gospel?" ("Are the Words of Exodus 20:6 to Be Received and Taught as Law or as Gospel Promise?")

V. Miscellaneous Items

1. A. Pieper, "*Ueber den Unterschied der reformierten und lutherischen Auffassung vom sogenannten dritten Brauch des Gesetzes*," QS, Vol. 13, No. 2 (April, 1916), pp. 120-133.

English translation (A. Schulz): This translation was distributed to the CLC pastors in the mid-70's in connection with their study of the third use of the Law.

2. H. Speckard, "*Summarische Auslegung des Hohenlieds*," *Lehre und Wehre*, Vol. 54, Nos. 3-7, 9-10, & 12 (1908: March to July, September to October, and December).

English translation (Paul W. Ludwig, Sr.): "Summary

Interpretation of the Song of Solomon," WLQ, Vol. 62 (1965), Nos. 1-4; Vol. 63 (1966), Nos. 2-4. The last two sections were inadvertently printed in reverse order.

3. Essay published in the Wisconsin Synod seminary catalog of 1911-1912 and 1917-1918.

English translation (graduate students Roger Fleming, Mark Jeske, and Daniel Schaller; Prof. Wilbert R. Gawrisch): J. Schaller, "The Origin and Development of the New Testament Ministry," WLQ, Vol. 78, No. 1 (January, 1981), pp. 30-51.

4. Essay delivered at the 15th biennial convention of the Ev. Luth. Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States at New Ulm, Minnesota, in August, 1919.

English translation (Heinrich J. Vogel): A. Pieper, "The True Reconstruction of the Church," WLQ, Vol. 62, No. 2 (April, 1965), pp. 81-120; Vol. 62, No. 3 (July, 1965), pp. 183-205.

5. English translation (Max N. Herrmann): Prof. William Henkel, "The Status of Woman in the New Testament Church," WLQ, Vol. 58, No. 3 (July, 1961), pp. 210-223; Vol. 59, No. 1 (January, 1962), pp. 27-42. The German source is not given, and is unknown to me.

R. E. Wehrwein

PRIVATE EDUCATION AND THE LAW*

INTRODUCTION How long is the long arm of the law? It must be acknowledged that the "reach" of governmental actions is extensive in regulating and influencing society, in general, and individual liberties, in particular. The history of American jurisprudence is one of attempting to balance the interests of the state to protect public needs with the rights of individual citizens. President Abraham Lincoln summarized this dilemma: "Must a government of necessity be too strong for the liberties of its people, or too weak to maintain its own

* Delivered at the Minnesota Delegate Conference of the CLC at New Ulm, Minnesota, on June 28, 1981.

existence?"

However, there is another arm, more powerful, which has a much greater influence upon us. In fact, this arm embraces us and defines our whole purpose and being. When these contending arms are competing for us, who wins? "The Lord ...; His right hand and His holy arm hath gotten Him the victory," (Psalm 98:1). "Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ," (I Cor. 15:57). It is assumed that though, as believers, we are not "of" this world, yet we share concern about the "in" the world aspects of our lives. This is especially the case when the arm of the law (government) reaches out in an attempt to shake hands or wrestle with the holy arm of our Savior Lord. The role of private education in America represents one such area of concern.

The purpose of this presentation is to review the law of our country with respect to parochial schools, to discuss areas of sanctioned governmental services, and to identify areas of Christian concern. It should be noted that this focus on parochial schools does not attempt to cover the whole area of conflict between religion and education, for there exists a whole series of issues relating to religion in public schools (i.e., Bible reading, prayer, evolution, flag saluting, etc.). However, in order to limit the scope of this treatment, we have chosen to concentrate our attention on private, religious-affiliated elementary and secondary schools.

PART I

Christian Education In Luther's explanation of the First Article we confess that "I believe that God has made me with all creatures, giving me ... my reason and all my faculties." The gift of mental faculties is not to be treated lightly, for it is a blessing of God to be nurtured and used for His glory. In addition, God has given us a reason for reasoning, when He directs us to use these capabilities "to subdue (the earth) and have dominion ... over every living thing," (Genesis 2:28). Scripture lays the responsibility for the intellectual growth of a Christian child on parents, to bring children up "in the nurture and admonition of

the Lord," (Eph. 6:4). "Train up a child in the way he should go; and when he is old, he will not depart from it," (Proverbs 22:6). Our objective as Christian parents is to have our children develop a spiritual maturity in the use of their intellectual capabilities. Paul wrote a number of times about growing up and not remaining childish in understanding (I Cor. 3:1ff.; Heb. 5:12ff.).

This concern for Christian education has both a focus and a result. "Give instruction to a wise man, and he will be yet wiser; teach a just man, and he will increase in learning. The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; and the knowledge of the holy is understanding," (Proverbs 9:9-10). The source for all understanding is the gift of God, our Savior from sin, Jesus Christ. This scriptural perspective applied to all academic disciplines provides a Christ-centered orientation for examining and making decisions with respect to matters of life on this earth.

Several avenues for augmenting the parental responsibility of training their children are provided within our churches: including worship services, Bible and catechetical instruction, and schools (Sunday, vacation, and Christian Day). The most intensive instructional support for our children is through the parochial school. We cherish this opportunity where all curricula are presented in the context of our belief in our Savior. However, it is in this area where we find ourselves competing with the government for the time and influence of our children.

We are not alone in this view of the school curriculum. Pope Pius XI in a 1929 Encyclical Letter stated "that every subject taught be permeated with Christian piety." It should be noted that most Supreme Court cases involving private education involve Catholic parochial schools. Justice Stewart stated in a 1975 court opinion that:

The very purpose of many of those schools is to provide an integrated secular and religious education; the teaching process is, to a large extent, devoted to the inculcation of religious values and beliefs. ... The secular education those schools provide goes

hand in hand with the religious mission, that is the only reason for the school's existence. Within the institution, the two are inextricably intertwined. (95 Sct 1753)

In a brief presented to the Supreme Court in 1981, the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod stated, "If it were not for the purpose of inculcating religious doctrine into the curricula, there would be no reason whatever to run a separate school system coterminous with that provided by the state."

Thus, we jealously guard the right to provide a Christ-centered education for our children through our parochial schools. We teach what by law public schools cannot teach. For surely if the church neglects the children, someday the children may neglect the church. The internal change agent, our Savior from sin, is controlled and delivered for our children by the Holy Spirit. The external change agents, influencing factors of teacher, parents, environment (peers) and curriculum can be controlled and delivered via a Christian Day School.

Public Education Initial schools in America were private, church sponsored, and grew out of European school models. Thomas Jefferson in expressing concern for preservation of the newly established United States recognized two concerns which foretold the need for public education in America:

- "How can a nation best cull the natural aristocracy of talents and virtue and prepare it by education at the public expense for the care of public concerns?"
- "What degree of instruction is required in order that our liberties may be safe in the hands of the people?"

The public school movement as we know it today had its beginning in the 1830's, principally under the leadership of Horace Mann. It was in Massachusetts under Mann's direction that the first state Board of Education was established in 1837 and the first legislation regarding compulsory school attendance was enacted in 1852.

Mann, aptly called the "Father of the Common Schools," asserted that "the common school is the greatest discovery ever made by man ... other social organizations are curative and remedial; this is a preventive and an antidote ..." (*The Common School Journal*, 3:15, 1841). A governmental structure had been developed to educate the children, to teach them English and to Americanize them. By the early 1900's all states had established public school systems for children at the elementary and secondary levels which were financed through local and state tax revenue. Today 80% of all school age elementary and secondary students receive their educational services from public schools. The approximate cost to the public for the slightly more than 40 million public school students during the 1980-81 school year is 116 billion dollars. Thus, the public investment in its future citizens for perpetuating its democratic government and developing marketable skills to support its capitalist economy is substantial, representing over 5% of the Gross National Product.

Proponents of public education are extremely concerned about private education, especially in the areas of financial aid, control, and equal opportunity access for such services. These concerns become more pronounced during periods of limited governmental financial resources. Perhaps Dr. James Conant best delineated this conflict by stating,

The greater the proportion of our youth who fail to attend our public schools and who receive their education elsewhere, the greater the threat to democratic unity. To use taxpayers' money to assist private schools is to suggest that American society use its own hands to destroy itself. (*Education and Liberty*, 81)

Laws of the United States The Constitution of the United States is the basic law of the land. All statutes passed by Congress or the state legislatures, ordinances of local government units (Legislative Branch) and rules and regulations of governmental agencies, including school boards (Executive Branch) are subject to the provisions of the Constitution. The Consti-

tution covers a wide area of powers, duties and limitations, but at no point does it refer expressly to education.

Six years after securing freedom for the United States, the Constitution was ratified in 1787 by convention action. James Madison drafted and proposed the first ten amendments, the Bill of Rights, which were adopted in 1791 and added to the Constitution. Constitutional amendments established the set of assumptions and framework for church-state relationships. Thus, it is under the following constitutional amendments that we find consideration of private education issues:

First Amendment: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof ..."

(This amendment under the leadership of Thomas Jefferson was designed to insure certain basic personal freedoms and civil rights including religious freedom.)

Tenth Amendment: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

(This provision clearly limits the role of the federal government to certain specific powers. Since providing educational services is not a function defined in the U. S. Constitution, we find that responsibility for providing and maintaining an educational system included in the constitution of each state.)

Fourteenth Amendment: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of the law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

(This amendment has had wide application to educa-

tion, ensuring that an individual is protected from deprivation of rights, property, or equal protection without due legal process. By defining citizens as all persons, this is the last significant amendment dealing with personal rights.)

The judicial branch of government as manifested in the United States Supreme Court functions as a continuation of the Constitutional Convention. Chief Justice Marshall in the case of *Marbury v. Madison*, 1803, established the precedence of judicial power to declare laws unconstitutional. The power of judicial review extends to all areas of the legislative and executive branches of government, by interpreting the meaning of the Constitution when applied to specific cases.

In the non-public school area, frequently the Fourteenth and First Amendments have to be examined. The substantive Fourteenth Amendment proscription is against public funds being used for sectarian purposes, a subcategory of private purposes. In addition, due process protection implies procedures which provide for equal treatment in making decisions. It should be noted that the courts tend to assume that violation of procedures implies violation of principles.

PART II

Case Reviews Perhaps the best way to examine the role of private education in the United States is by reviewing chronologically relevant cases brought before the Supreme Court, for it is only in this setting that statutes and regulations are considered in light of the U. S. Constitution, which forms the basic set of assumptions on which our government functions. Typically, the constitutionality of legislation is challenged when appropriations of public funds appear to be used for and provide benefit to private rather than public purposes.

The Supreme Court has recognized the significant contribution of parochial education to American society in the court opinions of numerous cases. Justice White wrote in the *Board of Education v. Allen* case,

"Americans care about the quality of the secular education available to their children ... Considering this attitude, the continued willingness to rely on private school systems, including parochial systems, strongly suggests that a wide segment of informed opinion, legislative and otherwise, has found that those schools do an acceptable job of providing secular education to their students. This judgment is further evidence that parochial schools are performing, in addition to the sectarian function, the task of secular education." (88 S Ct 1923)

In concluding remarks by Chief Justice Burger in the *Lemon v. Kurtzman* case we read,

"Finally, nothing we have said can be construed to disparage the role of church-related elementary and secondary schools in our national life. Their contribution has been and is enormous." (91 S Ct 2105)

Due Process Clause The initial cases involving private education dealt with the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Thus, issues relating to religious affiliation of parochial schools were not factors in the initial development of precedence for court opinions with respect to private education.

In the 1923 case of *Meyer v. Nebraska*, a teacher in private school was convicted of teaching German in violation of a Nebraska statute prohibiting the teaching of foreign languages in public or private schools. The spirit of this legislation was consistent with the objectives of the common public school, to teach all children English. The Supreme Court stated,

"That the State may do much ... in order to improve the quality of its citizens physically, mentally and morally is clear, but the individual has certain fundamental rights which must be respected." (262 US 390)

The court held that parents have a right to control the education of their children, including the curriculum.

The landmark case regarding private education occurred in 1925, *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*. At issue was an Oregon statute on compulsory education requiring all children between the ages of 8 and 16 to attend public school. In part this legislation was motivated by child labor laws and the need to provide some activity for this age group being removed from the labor force. However, the net effect of this statute would have been one of eliminating private schools in that state.

Two concerns were addressed by the court in the *Pierce* case on the basis of the Fourteenth Amendment: the right of parents to choose schools for their children and the deprivation of property rights without due process of law for corporations providing education to compulsory attendance age children. In a strongly worded opinion, the court stated,

"The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in this Union repose excludes any general power of the state to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the state; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligation." (45 S Ct 571)

Private education was endorsed in light of constitutional scrutiny in this case, with the opinion of the court serving as a basic assumption for all future deliberations. Parents do have a right to choose schools for their children's education, and private schools may not be deprived of property (corporate purpose and function) without due process.

The third case involving the due process clause occurred in 1930, *Cochran v. Louisiana State Board of Education*. A Louisiana statute provided free textbooks for children attending both public and private schools. At issue in this case was the use of private property which became public through taxation for non-public purposes. In the court opinion we read,

"The appropriations were made for the specific purpose of purchasing school books for the use of the school children of the state, free of cost to them. It was for their benefit and the resulting benefit to the state. ... The schools, however, are not the beneficiaries of these appropriations. ... The school children and the state alone are the beneficiaries." (50 Sct 335)

In addition to the court upholding this free textbook statute, the initial criteria for reviewing aid to private education were established. The "Child Benefit Theory" requires that two factors be considered:

- the intent of the legislation (equal benefit to all), and
- the recipient of the aid (parent and/or child and not the private school).

Establishment Clause It was not until the post-World War II time frame that the court considered the religious affiliation aspect regarding private schools. As previously indicated, the First Amendment of the Constitution respecting the establishment or free exercise of religion became the applicable standard for judicial opinion.

The first and most important case was considered by the Supreme Court in 1947, *Everson v. Board of Education of Ewing Township*. In that year the court considered a New Jersey statute authorizing reimbursement to all parents for money expended for public bus transportation of their children to public or private schools. The appellant focused constitutional concern on the establishment clause by contending that the use of state taxation money of some citizens by bestowing it to others for private purposes, namely support of parochial schools, forced contributions for the support of church schools.

Justice Black in a very quotable majority opinion for this 5-4 holding of the Supreme Court included an extensive discussion of the establishment and free exercise clauses of the First Amendment of the Constitution. We quote the following:

"The establishment of religion clause of the First Amendment means at least this: Neither State nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can it force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or non-attendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a State nor Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa.

"In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect a 'wall of separation' between Church and State.

"The free exercise clause of the First Amendment ... requires the State to be a neutral in its relations with groups of religious believers and non-believers; it does not require the State to be their adversary. State power is no more to be used so as to handicap religions, than it is to favor them.

"State statutes cannot exclude ... the members of any ... faith, because of their faith or lack of it, from receiving benefits of public welfare legislation." (67 S Ct 504)

The court enunciated the separation principle (establishment clause) by not allowing government aid to parochial schools, adopted the neutrality principle (free exercise clause) by not excluding citizens from welfare programs because of religion, and affirmed the child-benefit theory (due process clause) by insuring that there was equal benefit for all and that the children/parents were the beneficiaries. In considering the specific issue at hand, the court recognized that there are accept-

able parochial school uses of certain governmental services such as police and fire protection, sewage and water, public roads, health, etc. The transportation statute was determined not to be in violation of the constitution since it established a general program to help parents get their children, regardless of their religion, safely and expeditiously to and from their schools.

During the 1950's and early 1960's there were several Supreme Court cases which dealt with religion and education issues such as released time for religious instruction, prayer, and Bible reading in public schools. These cases provided opportunities for the court to further refine the meaning of the First Amendment with respect to religion. It was not until 1968, Board of Education of Central School District Number 1, New York, v. Allen, that the next significant case was heard regarding parochial schools. The source of concern was a New York statute requiring local school boards to purchase textbooks and to lend them free of charge to all children in private or public schools. The statute is quite similar to the one considered by the Supreme Court in Cochran; however, the constitutionality issue was with the establishment clause because it authorized the loaning of textbooks to students attending parochial schools.

In the court opinion written by Justice White, the majority relied heavily on previous holding as we see evidenced in the following quotes:

"Underlying these cases and underlying also the legislative judgments that have preceded the court decisions has been a recognition that private education has played and is playing a significant and valuable role in raising national levels of knowledge, competence, and experience.

"However, this Court has long recognized that religious schools pursue two goals, religious instruction and secular education.

"Since Pierce, a substantial body of case law has confirmed the power of the States to insist that attendance at private schools, if it is to satisfy

state compulsory attendance laws, be at institutions which provide minimum hours of instruction, employ teachers of specified training, and cover prescribed subjects of instruction." (88 SCt 1923)

The court upheld the New York statute and established an important precedent of constitutionality by condoning public aid beyond the door of the non-public church-sponsored school. The reasoning of the court was supported along three lines:

1. Public welfare by extending the benefits of state laws to all its citizens without regard to their religious affiliation.

2. Child benefit by insuring that the benefits of legislation flow to the parents and children, and not to the parochial school.

3. Secular purpose by determining that the principle or primary purpose of the statute is to neither advance nor inhibit religion.

An important element of judicial consideration was added in 1970, *Walz v. New York City Tax Commission*. The constitutionality of tax exemptions for church property was at issue in this case. Chief Justice Burger wrote the court opinion which further established the Supreme Court as activist under his leadership in this area of concern. He summarized the meaning of establishment of a religion as connotating "sponsorship, financial support, and active involvement of the sovereign in religious activity ... We will not tolerate either governmentally established or governmental interference with religion." (397 US 664)

"We must ... be sure that the end result — the effect — is not an excessive governmental entanglement with religion. The test is inescapably one of degree."

With these statements a new test was defined for church-state issues. The court recognized the impossibility of total church-state separation by citing examples

including "state requirements under compulsory school attendance laws as necessary and permissible contacts."

"In order to determine whether the government entanglement with religion is excessive, we must examine

- the character and purpose of the institutions benefited,
- the nature of the aid that the state provides, and
- the resulting relationship between the government and the religious activity." (397 US 664)

The court held that governmental taxation of church property would increase entanglement; therefore, the tax exemption statute was constitutional. The supporting reasoning centered around the concern of requiring continual surveillance by the church or the state and the cumulative impact of such a relationship.

This leads us in our review to the 1971 case of *Lemon v. Kurtzman* in which the excessive entanglement standard, in addition to others, was applied to direct aid to parochial schools. For Supreme Court consideration, a Pennsylvania statute, authorizing the state superintendent to purchase specified secular education services from non-public schools, was combined with a Rhode Island statute authorizing state officials to supplement salaries of parochial school teachers of secular subjects.

Chief Justice Burger, eager to apply the entanglement test he defined the previous year, also wrote this court opinion. A series of quotes serves to illustrate the thinking of the court in this case:

"Under our system the choice has been made that government is to be entirely excluded from the area of religious instruction and churches excluded from the affairs of government. The Constitution decrees that religion must be a private matter for the individual, the family and the institutions of private choice, and that while some involvement and entanglement is inevitable, lines must be drawn.

"Our decisions from *Everson* to *Allen* have permitted

the States to provide church-related schools with secular material, or nonideological services, facilities or materials. Bus transportation, school lunches, public health services, and secular textbooks supplied in common to all students were not thought to offend the establishment clause. ... In both cases, the Court was careful to point out that state aid was provided to the student and his parents - not to the church-related school.

"State aid cannot be provided on the basis or mere assumption that secular teachers under religious discipline can avoid conflicts. The State must be certain, given the Religion Clauses, that subsidized teachers do not inculcate religion - indeed the State here has undertaken to do so.

"Unlike a book, a teacher cannot be inspected once so as to determine the extent and intent of his or her personal beliefs and subjective acceptance of the limitations imposed by the First Amendment.

"Obviously a direct money subsidy would be a relationship pregnant with involvement and, as with most governmental grant programs, could encompass sustained and detailed administrative relationships by enforcement of statutory or administrative standards ..." (91 Sct 2105)

The court sought answers to the following four questions:

1. Does the statute reflect a secular legislative purpose?
2. Is the primary effect to advance or inhibit religion (neutrality)?
3. Does the implementation inhibit the free exercise of religion (accommodation)?
4. Does its administration foster an excessive government entanglement with religion?

In a near unanimous opinion (recently retire Justice Stewart being the lone dissenter), the court stated that the statutes regarding parochial were unconstitutional by violating the establishment clause of the First Amendment.

This case was not only significant in the fact that a consensus among the justices had emerged, but also that it put the brakes on forms of state aid to parochial schools.

During the 1970's, the Supreme Court has consistently applied the tests of Secular Purpose, Neutrality, Accommodation, and Excessive Entanglement to each case before the bench involving various forms of state aid to parochial schools in applying the Establishment/Free Exercise clause of the First Amendment.

In the Committee for Public Education and Religious Liberty v. Nyquist case (1973), the court rejected a New York statute authorizing tuition grants and tax credits to low income families for parochial school patrons. Two reasons were cited: that the state had singled out a class of its citizens for special economic benefit, and whether the statute was an incentive or reward, its intended consequence was to preserve and support religious-oriented institutions. With current presidential interest in tax credits and tuition grants it is likely in the near future that the court will have to deal with this issue again.

The Meek v. Pittenger case of 1975 revolved around a Pennsylvania statute providing direct loans of instructional materials and equipment, and auxiliary services performed on parochial school property by public school teachers. Since the use of instructional support materials and equipment cannot be controlled and may be used for religious instruction, the court declared this statute unconstitutional.

The court revisited these topics in 1977, Wolman v. Walter. At issue was an Ohio statute providing non-public school students various books, materials and services. The court upheld textbooks, testing and scoring services, diagnostic services (psychologist, speech, hearing, sight), and therapeutic services (health, guidance, remedial) and rejected once again instructional materials and equipment, and transportation for field trips.

Recent Cases Several recent cases involving aspects of admissions and teachers in private

schools are of interest. In 1977, *Runyan v. McCrary*, at issue was the right of parents to send their children to a private, non-sectarian, racially segregated school in Virginia. Conversely stated was the right of a private school not to provide contracted educational services to a child applying for admission. The court upheld the parents' right on the basis of the Civil Rights Act of 1866, Section 1981, stating,

"White parents avoided the effects of desegregation orders by sending their children to private 'segregationist academies' thus making desegregation orders against public schools less effective in remedying past constitutional violations." (96 Sct 2586)

The hidden agenda in this opinion was a matter of turf protection, because the judicial system was issuing the court orders for desegregation and segregated private schools were viewed as a slap in the face. Justice White in a dissenting opinion cast serious doubts upon the majority opinion, "A person does not have a right to make a contract with an unwilling private person, no matter what that person's motivation for refusing to contract."

Nevertheless the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) based upon this case attempted to establish admission and enrollment guidelines for private schools in 1978 with the threat of loss of tax exempt status for non-compliance. Many of us took this opportunity to express our concern about the proposed regulations to both IRS and Congress. During 1979 the public response was overwhelming. In early 1980 the Supreme Court let the word out that it was ready to act on the proposed regulations in a test case. Congress in its role of reacting to abuses, quickly passed legislation stating that IRS did not have the authority for making such regulations.

Collective bargaining and labor relations have been major issues in public education during the 1970's. Applicability of such legislation to parochial teachers has recently been addressed by the Supreme Court. In 1979, *NLRB v. Bishop of Chicago*, the court stated that the National Labor Relations Act did not apply to teachers at church-related schools. Just last month the court unani-

mously ruled that unemployment compensation tax payments were not required for parochial school teachers in a case brought by the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod.

Summary By reviewing chronologically a series of United States Supreme Court cases, we have seen the formal conscience of the nation reflected on the issue of church/state relationships with respect to private education. Each court opinion has tended to establish precedents and guidelines for subsequent cases. The following summarizes the constitutional status of private schools in America:

1. Private schools may exist for secular as well as religious education.

2. The state may establish criteria for private schools in the areas of facilities, teacher certification, minimum curriculum, and compulsory attendance.

3. The state may provide benefits to children attending private schools for the following education-related services: transportation, textbooks, testing, diagnostics (psychologist, medical), therapeutic (health, guidance, remediation), and lunch (food, commodities).

4. In order for public financial aid to be made available to students attending parochial (private, religious-affiliated) schools, such aid must pass the scrutiny of the following tests regarding the religious establishment/free exercise clause of the First Amendment:

- Secular Legislative Purpose
- Religious Neutrality (Neither advance nor inhibit)
- Excessive Entanglement of Government with Religion

This suggests that any legislation related to private education must benefit equally all children/parents regardless of religious affiliation or attendance at public or private schools; must be intended for secular purposes of public welfare; must not be directed at the private school; and must not require regular distinctions between the secular and the religious.

The court has attempted to preserve the separation principle for church and state, although the wall is not nearly as high nor as solid as some desire. We support all efforts to maintain this separation. The state's function of citizen protection from others and self should not interfere with our church's concern for sharing the saving message of Jesus Christ. We render unto the state such things as taxes and obedience; and in a separate, but first priority, we render unto the Lord such things as worship, praise, and love. In the area of private instruction for our children, we want to preserve the control we can exercise over our children's education.

James Sydow

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Articles, Papers, and Books

Bible

- Burgess, Faith E., *Church-State Relations During the Last 200 Years*, Washington, D.C., 1976.
- Carlile, A. B., "Compulsory Attendance Laws in the United States: Historical Background," *Education Law and Administration*, 4:35-47, April, 1936.
- Conant, James B., *Education and Liberty*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1958.
- Hooker, Clifford P., ed., *The Courts and Education*, the 77th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1978.
- Nehrt, Roy C., *Private Schools in American Education*, National Center for Education statistics, Washington, D.C., 1981.
- Nolting, Paul F., *Consistency or Inconsistency?*, Sleepy Eye, MN, 1966.
- Reuter, E. Edmund and Hamilton, Robert R., *The Law of Public Education*, Foundation Press, New York, Chapter 2: Church, State, Education Relationships, 13-72, 1976.
- Reuter, E. Edmund and Hamilton, Robert R., *1979 Supplement to The Law of Public Education*, Foundation Press, New York, Chapter 2: Church, State, Education

Relationships, 1-16, 1979.

Schreyer, Gene R., *Religious Freedom under the First Amendment*, Mankato, MN, 1976.

Law Reviews

- "The Establishment Clause, Congress and the Schools: An Historical Perspective," *Virginia Law Review*, 52: 1395, December 1966.
- "Constitutional Law - Aid to Parochial Schools and the Establishment Clause - Everson to Allen: From Busses to Books and Beyond," *DePaul Law Review*, 18:785, Summer 1969.
- "Nine Rulings: Three Wins, Three Losses, and Three Remands on Government Aid to Church Related Institutions," *Catholic Lawyer*, 17:182, Summer 1971.
- "Parochial School Aid from Allen to Lemon: Out at Second, Safe at First," *Seton Hall Law Review*, 3:61, Fall 1971.
- "Review of Supreme Court Decisions on Aid to Nonpublic Elementary and Secondary Education," *Hastings Law Journal*, 23:966, March 1972.
- "Constitutional Law - Aid to Parochial Schools: First Pronouncement of Precise Standards for State Aid to Parochial Schools," *DePaul Law Review*, 21:784, Spring 1972.
- "Persistent Problems of Church, State, and Education," *Journal of Law and Education*, 1:601, October 1972.
- "Freedom of Religion and Compulsory Education," *Arkansas Law Review*, 26:555, 1973.
- "Law and the Private School," *Valparaiso University Law Review*, 9:1975, Spring 1975.
- "Runyon v. McCrary and Regulation of Private Schools," *Indiana Law Journal*, 52:747, Summer 1977.
- "National Labor Relations Board versus Catholic Bishop of Chicago," *Catholic Lawyer*, 25:336, Autumn 1980.

Cases

- 1923 Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 US 390: Constitutional Right of State to Prescribe the Curricula of Church Related Schools (Nebraska).
- 1925 Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 268 US 510, 45 SCt 571: Constitutional Right to Attend Private Schools

- (Oregon).
- 1930 Cochran v. Louisiana State Board of Education, 281 US 37, 50 Sct 335: Constitutionality of State Furnished Free Textbooks for Children Attending Private Schools (Louisiana).
- 1947 Everson v. Board of Education of Ewing Township, 330 US 1, 67 Sct 504: Constitutionality of Providing Transportation to Parochial Schools at Public Expense (New Jersey).
- 1968 Board of Education of Central School District Number 1 v. Allen, 392 US 236, 88 Sct 1923: Constitutionality of Providing Textbooks to Parochial School Students (New York).
- 1970 Walz v. New York City Tax Commission, 387 US 664: Constitutionality of Granting Property Tax Exemptions to Religious Institutions (New York).
- 1971 Lemon v. Kurtzman, 403 US 602, 91 Sct 2105: Constitutionality of Reimbursements to Parochial Schools (Pennsylvania and Rhode Island - Early v. D.Censo).
- 1973 Committee for Public Education and Religious Liberty v. Nyquist, 413 US 756, 93 Sct 2955: Constitutionality of Tuition Grants and Tax Credits for Parochial School Patrons (New York).
- 1975 Meek v. Pittenger, 421 US 349, 95 Sct 1753: Constitutionality of Providing Auxiliary Services to Parochial School Students (Pennsylvania).
- 1977 Runyon v. McCrary, 96 Sct 2586: Constitutionality of Discriminatory Admissions in Private Schools (Virginia).
- 1977 Wolman v. Walter, 433 US 229, 97 Sct 2593: Constitutionality of Providing Certain Services to Parochial School Students (Ohio).
- 1979 NLRB v. Bishop of Chicago, 440 US 490: Constitutionality of Applying the NLRB to Teachers at Church Operated Schools (Illinois).

NOTICE: More requests for the article by Prof. John Lau published in the June, 1982, issue ("An Open Letter to Students and Alumni of Northwestern College") have come than we are able to fulfil. It has been decided, with authorization from former Pres. Albrecht, to publish the article as a reprint. Copies may be obtained, at cost, by ordering from the CLC Book House, Immanuel Lutheran College, 501 Grover Road, Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701.

IMMANUEL LUTHERAN COLLEGE - OPENING ADDRESS
AUGUST 23, 1982

The Word of our God from which we would learn this morning is recorded by Peter in his first letter, chapter 1:24-25:

For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: but the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.

With these divine words of absolute truth our God sets forth some basics for our consideration. We note first of all the broad statement concerning all flesh. This generic term embraces all of mankind, and the comparison is made: all flesh is as grass. God goes on to point out that even the glory of man — his strength, youth, thoughtfulness, intelligence, genius, mercy, love, kindness, humanitarianism — even that glory of man is as the flower of the grass. The grass, once tender, green, and full of growth eventually withers and dies. The flowers of the grass, so fragile, beautiful, fragrant, delicate, also have their day to wilt, droop, drop their petals, dry up and fall off.

We do find among our fellow human beings an assortment of good, strong, kind, helpful, thoughtful people. What saddens is what we have known all along: the very best as well as the least among mortals will have their day to droop, fade, dry up and fall off. But despite this dreadful knowledge, man has found it worth some of his best efforts to train, educate, and prepare young people for their temporary futures. Parents are genuinely concerned that their young people develop personality, character, skills, wisdom to serve them whatever number of days may be theirs. The world about us is very concerned about education, and especially about the basics of life. Parents have had it with the trivia of education; they have been most unhappy with the unsatisfactory results of such an education for their children. But ...

where to go for the real basics? What are the real basics? The proverbial three R's, plus ... plus ...?

Ever since the time of the fall of man into sin, our God has demonstrated that the very best efforts of the world to give their children the basics for life still end with the curse of death. Physically, materially, our young people's careers may prosper and flower ... for a while. But God's truth stands: all flesh is grass. Both the grass and the flower of it will wither and drop off ... dead!

Our God has therefore responded to man's concern with a mere education unto death, by revealing and recording the basics which educate without failure, without limitation. He gives to man the basics for Life ... education for an on-going, never-to-be-interrupted life! God assures man: "The Word of the Lord lives unto eternity - this is the Word which has been preached (taught) as good news unto you!"

The basic truth that God would have us teach for never-ending life is His Gospel, the good news, the love God has had for us all, the world of human flesh. No difference among human flesh ... all corrupt, all sinful, all condemned, all involved in the death. But the good news is that God would not have mankind die the death of everlasting torment for sin. The good news is that God sent His Son to bear and to pay for all our guilt and sin, and to give to us the holy righteousness of His Son. The good news is the gift of eternal life through our Lord Jesus Christ. The good news is that God sent with His Word His Holy Spirit to change our fleshly hearts and minds that reject this love as foolishness. And finally the good news is that in His great love God has assured each of us of never-ending life in heaven through our Spirit-worked faith, a faith that knows the good news and clings to it for dear life!

The Church of the Lutheran Confession, our Immanuel Lutheran College, our parents and students alike are all concerned about the quality of education for our young people. Let it be clear: at ILC we have a keen concern about the basics in education! Thank God that we know

what the basics of Life are, and that through His Word He has given us these basics in abundant supply, with the promise of the necessary guidance and direction to use such Means of Grace wisely and efficiently.

As teachers and students alike we are mindful of what manner of dust we are, and just how difficult it really is for His children to walk safely through their earth-time. But our sufficiency is of God, Who not only directs our lives with the basics of the Gospel, but adds every promise to be with His children, to watch over, to care for, to guide, instruct, correct and bless them.

So, welcome to Immanuel! Welcome to ILC, where we not only have a concern for the basics in education, but have in rich supply the very means to education effectively unto Life. Thank God for the basics whereby we live!

Gordon Radtke

REVIEW

Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties, Gleason L. Archer. Zondervan, 1982. Hard cover. 476 pp.

Dr. Gleason L. Archer, an experienced scholar who confesses the inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures, has produced an interesting and enlightening book that deals with alleged contradictions in the Bible as well as various problems that bring into question the accuracy of the Biblical account.

In a lengthy introduction, Dr. Archer points out very convincingly the importance of hanging on to the doctrine of total Biblical inerrancy. In this he seems to be in complete agreement with Dr. Harold Lindsell, the author of *The Battle for the Bible* and *The Bible in the Balance*. Dr. Lindsell and Dr. Archer were both teachers at Fuller Theological Seminary when that school espoused

the inerrancy of the Bible. But now Fuller has given way under pressure to the theory of an inerrancy limited to matters of faith and doctrine. This surrender of total inerrancy has in past history invariably led to the loss of other Bible teachings until even the teaching of Christ's resurrection is denied. The present-day attacks on inerrancy presage a total apostasy from the Christian faith in another generation or two.

Dr. Archer is convinced that Jesus Christ, our Lord, accepted the Old Testament as factual, not only in matters of doctrine but also in matters of history and science. Jesus accepted the historicity of Adam and Eve, the universal Flood, the manna in the wilderness, and the swallowing up of Jonah by the fish. Why should we do any less? "No support whatever can be found for the distinction between historical, scientific truth and doctrinal, metaphysical truth" (p. 24).

Although our present-day copies of the Holy Scriptures are not inerrant, the original autographs were inerrant, having been breathed out by God through various human authors. By the careful study of the copies that have come down to us, scholars can in most cases establish without a doubt what the original wording must have been. In those cases where some doubt remains, Dr. Archer points out that "if any decently attested variant were taken up from the apparatus at the bottom of the page and were substituted for the accepted reading of the standard text, there would in no case be a single, significant alteration in doctrine or message" (p. 30).

We have no quarrel with Dr. Archer's introduction. But when we come to the body of the work, the discussion of individual Bible passages and Bible concepts, we find many areas of disagreement. This, I suppose, should not surprise us. A basic agreement on Scriptural inerrancy on the part of all major groups in the Reformation era did not prevent differences in doctrine from arising between the papists, the Lutherans, the Calvinists, the Anabaptists, etc. They agreed that the Bible is God's Word. But they did not agree on the interpretation of the Bible. People come to the Bible with preconceived ideas, and these ideas are read into the Bible. The pa-

pists read the Bible in terms of their tradition. Martin Luther at first read and explained the Bible in this same traditionalistic way. But the Holy Spirit enlightened Luther in the true meaning of the Gospel and the distinction between Law and Gospel, and this in itself enabled him to get a much clearer grasp of the Bible's intended meaning.

Dr. Archer's background is apparently premillennialistic. He explains passages in Ezekiel and Daniel and Revelation as well as passages from Matthew and John in terms of the millennium. To us who have not been brought up in millennialism these passages clearly teach something different from what Dr. Archer derives from them.

His general principles of interpretation are sound. The Bible is not to be interpreted altogether literally or altogether figuratively, but the intention of the author must be determined on the basis of the context. But still we cannot always agree with his conclusions.

We agree with what he says on capital punishment, abortion, the ordination of women pastors, Moses' authorship of the Pentateuch, the historicity of Adam and Eve, the unity of Isaiah, the date of Daniel, the substitutionary life and death of our Lord Jesus, and His genuine physical resurrection from the dead on the third day. We believe that his remarks in these areas are proved by the clear Scriptures he quotes.

But we disagree with his millennialism. Jesus said: "My kingdom is not of this world" (John 18:36). But Dr. Archer does not let Jesus' word stand absolutely, for he says, "Christ's kingdom (prior to the kingdom age of the end time) was not of this world," (p. 343). At the time of the kingdom age, according to Dr. Archer, Jesus will reign over an earthly kingdom, preceded by such events as the erection of a new temple in Jerusalem, the reinstitution of bloody offerings, the coming of Antichrist, and the battle of Armageddon (pp. 280-281, 292).

We disagree also with Dr. Archer's contention that the Bible itself indicates that the days of creation are to be understood as stages of creation rather than as li-

teral 24-hour days. He reasons that the events of Genesis 2 (the creation of Adam, the putting him in his home, the naming of the animals, the deep sleep, the creation of Eve from Adam's rib) could not possibly have taken place in just a few hours but would have required days and even years. But we wonder whether the reason for his explanation is to be found in the contention of some scientists that the earth is much older than man, on the basis of fossil evidence.

We also find fault with Dr. Archer's view that "there may have been advanced and intelligent hominids who lived and died before Adam" (p. 64) without having true human souls. He also implies that Satan and his hosts fell away from God before creation, and does not totally rule out the theory that "the primeval fall of Satan was accompanied by a total ruin of earth itself" (p. 66), although he admits that the Scripture does not teach such a thing explicitly. But we on our part cannot accept the possibility of death before Adam's fall into sin, nor of the fall of Satan before God looked at His creation and pronounced everything very good.

Other explanations of Dr. Archer that we question are the following:

1) His explanation of 1 Peter 3:19, the proof passage for Jesus' descent into hell, concerning which he says: "We are forced to conclude that the proclamation referred to in v. 19 took place, not when Christ descended into Hades after His death on Calvary, but by the Spirit who spoke through the mouth of Noah during the years while the ark was under construction" (p. 424). In this same connection, Dr. Archer explains "paradise" in Luke 23:43 as being an "infernal paradise" or Hades, from which Old Testament believers were not set free until after Jesus' resurrection (p. 181, p. 367);

2) His failure to accept the possibility that a true believer in Christ can fall away (p. 420), even though Jesus in His parable of the sower and the seed spoke of those who believe for a time and fall away in time of temptation (Luke 8:13);

3) His strong contention that Sunday is the Christian sabbath, and that Col. 2:16 does not rule out a New Testament form of the Third Commandment requiring rest from labor on the first day of the week;

4) His belief that Christians are still forbidden to eat blood.

It should also be noted that Dr. Archer does not seem to understand the doctrine of universal or objective justification (p. 389, pp. 406-407). His doctrine of election seems in places to foster the view of an election in view of foreseen faith (pp. 389-390, 394-395), although his summary says well: "Whoever rejects the Lord Jesus must bear all the blame for remaining condemned and lost, but whoever is saved must give to God all the glory and honor for his salvation and his new life in Christ" (p. 395).

There are many good things about this book, and the careful reader will be helped in many ways. But we cannot recommend it without reservation for the reasons detailed above.

David Lau

BOOK NOTICES

HOLY BIBLE — The New King James Version.
Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson, Inc.,
Publisher. Burgundy hardcover. 1236 pp. \$12.95.
Available at CLC Book House, Immanuel Lutheran
College, Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701.

As of August, 1982, the new King James Version of the Holy Bible is offered for sale. Without any attempt at this time to review it, we offer Thomas Nelson's news release presenting the up-dated features of this latest version. Bible readers who have preferred the King James

version in preference to other versions that have come off the press will no doubt welcome this 1982 revision. The news release follows:

Why the New King James? Actually, updating the King James Version is not new. Since it was first translated in 1611, four major editions of the King James Bible (and hundreds of minor revisions) have been published. The edition currently being used, however, was last revised in 1769. Until now, the standard King James available has been the 1769 revision.

Almost immediately after the 1611 edition was published, the revision process was begun. In the 156 years between 1613 and 1769, there were approximately 24,000 differences in the text and punctuation of the King James version. Because these differences were not necessarily "authorized," an effort was made to standardize the King James Version; hence, the 1769 revision became "official," and further revisions, except minor ones, were stopped.

Today, hundreds of differences exist among the current editions of the King James Versions. But until now, there has been no scholarly effort to update the language for today while preserving the majesty and rhythm of the respected giant among all Bibles, indeed, among all of Western literature.

Seven years ago, the bold — and painstaking — task of making the King James Version understandable for today's readers was begun. Exhaustive research and tireless linguistic study were meshed with the manuscripts which form the basis of the original 1611 edition. The purpose was singular: to preserve the 1611 King James for 20th century readers without violating the theological integrity, the majestic grandeur, and the lyrical cadence of the original.

1. ARCHAIC VERBS AND PRONOUNS UPDATED. "Sheweth" now reads "shows." "Thee," "thou," and "thy" now read "you" and "your." Other archaic pronouns and verb endings have been updated in order to sim-

plify the understanding of God's Word.

2. UPDATED PUNCTUATION. When necessary, unclear punctuation has been updated in accordance with today's accepted usage without changing the meaning, beauty, or authority.

3. COMPLETE TEXT. Many recent translations actually delete parts of verses or chapters. The New King James Version contains every verse and chapter of the original translation.

4. PRONOUNS CAPITALIZED. Pronouns referring to God have been capitalized in keeping with contemporary writing style.

5. TRUE MEANINGS PRESERVED. The true meanings of words have been faithfully preserved according to commonly understood usage. For example, "naughtiness" is better understood today by using the word "wickedness," since "naughty" has a lighter, more playful connotation than when it was originally used.

6. QUOTATION MARKS ADDED. Quotation marks have been added to make dialogue easier to follow and the speakers easier to distinguish.

7. THEOLOGICAL TERMS RETAINED. The word "atonement" has a special meaning to Christians. This and similar theological terms have been kept intact as a guard against doctrinal misinterpretation.

8. COMPLETE FOOTNOTES. The footnotes on variant readings are the most complete found in any Bible today, and they contain the most common optional readings identified by manuscript sources.

9. MODERN FORMAT. Modern format enhances clarity through paragraph units, subject heads for topical units, poetic structure for lyrical passages, and italics for editor-supplied words.

From Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wis.: *The Life and Faith of Martin Luther*, by Adolph Fehlauer. Paper. 129 pp. \$5.95. -- This is a brief biographical presentation which may well serve members of our congregations who wish to become better acquainted with God's great gift to the Church - Martin Luther. *Katherine -- Wife of Luther*, by Clara Seuel Schreiber. Paper. 237 pp. \$6.95. -- As a companion piece to the preceding, this fictional biography of Katherine Luther may well be of special interest and edifying reading.

C. M. Gullerud

AN EDITOR'S NIGHTMARE

One of the hostile gremlins that threaten editors visited the March issue of our Journal and caused havoc. By some mischance, as yet unexplained, two entire pages of type were lost somewhere between the composing room and the printing and assembly line at the printer's; and one page of type was included twice. Thus each of the two essays in the issue was mutilated. In addition there was a glaring omission of several lines of text on page 18. The sabotage was not noticed until after the issue had been mailed to the subscribers.

We are profoundly sorry for this unfortunate imposition on the patience of our readers. In an effort to make the March issue readable, we are herewith supplying what it lacked, hoping that the subscribers will take the time to make the necessary changes as directed. Kindly follow these instructions:

1. There is an omission at the top of page 18 of the March issue. Please cut off the lines printed at the bottom of this page and paste them on the top of the defective page.
2. Page 15 of the March issue must be deleted. Please COVER it by pasting sheet No. 44B, supplied with this issue, over the type on the faulty page.
3. Page 22 of the March issue is also out of place. Please do as directed above, using the sheet numbered 44C to paste over.

Thank You. E. Schaller



their allegations or indictments must be judged by relevant evidence placed into the light of the testimony of the Holy Scriptures, and by the witness of the Holy Spirit to our preaching, not by the strength of abusive words. Our shortcomings, our frequent failure in the task of probing more deeply into the riches of revealed Truth, our some-

This is their sole assignment. And thus without question true preachers of the apostolic Word share in the glory of its ministry. Together with those who called them, and in the context of their particular Call, they have as much cause as Paul to declare themselves fervently committed to "ten diakonian tauten." Let them associate their wonderful directive, just as Paul did, with the mercy that prevailed in their lives, making them first of all unworthy partakers of the vast riches that are in Christ Jesus, of His redemption, His righteousness, His gracious spiritual endowments granted to believers.

There is a peculiar astigmatism which constantly threatens to produce in our minds a distorted image representing the preaching and teaching ministry as an occupation, a status among men somehow accredited by education, by a diploma or an academic degree, by a certificate of ordination. By such definition a position in the public ministry becomes an attainment, the result of personal choice and acquisition, and as a consequence seems to accrue to anyone who has made the effort and achieved human certification. But the sad fact is that there are far fewer true ministers of the Word than there are names on the roster of the Christian clergy. For such a position and title depends for its genuineness upon possession, not of a pulpit robe but of the robe of Christ's righteousness; not upon the multiplying of words, but upon a readiness to heed the stipulation of the Call to herald the Word (Titus 1:9). These endowments are the twin mercy-gifts accorded a true minister of the Gospel and constitute the source of his joy and the security of his office.

When such a man cherishes his ministry as Paul did his, it seems quite unthinkable that he would feel the need of stooping to engage in the "things that hide shame," that is, in "opportunism or falsifying the Word." Yet the most glorious ministry is not immune to the temptations of the flesh; and the peril of giving way to a certain ashamedness before the staring face of the world is ever with us. It is necessary for us, then, not merely to affirm renunciation of its disguises, but to pray diligently that we may

"nature," if only the term will be clearly understood and properly referred to the incarnate Christ. Taylor's paraphrase is here a masterpiece of accurate brevity: "Who, though He was God, did not demand and cling to His rights as God." Beck's opening clause ("Although He was God") is in substantial agreement with this. But when he goes on ("He decided not to take advantage of His being equal with God as though it were stolen goods") these last words put one squarely into the middle of the third problem that this crucial verse presents. Just what does the Apostle mean with the strange term, "robbery"?

It is a strange term, indeed, which Paul uses here. HARPAGMOS -- robbery. But the difficulty is resolved when one notes the point of comparison that Paul has in mind with this figure of speech. This eliminates the idea of something that has been acquired wrongfully, as the "robbery" of the AV suggests, and Beck's "stolen goods" makes so emphatic. Nor does the thought of violent or greedy acquisition fit into the picture, as ABS has it ("by force") and NEB at least suggests ("to snatch at"). The thought still lingers in RSV and NAS ("a thing to be grasped"). But the difficulty vanishes when we realize that the term applies also to the spoils of war which a victorious army may find in a conquered land and which it can convert to its own use, to meet its own needs. So it was with Jesus. He was true God. In Him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. He could have converted this "being equal with God" to His personal advantage with tremendous effect. He had the opportunity. But He did not take it. Instead:

(Verse 7) "He made Himself of no reputation" (AV), or as NAS translates very accurately, "emptied Himself." This confirms the solution of the previous problem. Powers that were His, and that He did use for others, He did not use to His own advantage. "He lays aside His power divine, A servant's form doth take." The same agreement obtains with regard to the next, His taking the "servant-form" (except for Taylor's "disguise"). Also the next phrase reveals no serious discrepancy. For whether one speaks of His "being born" or "being made" in the like-



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

STEVE SWANSON
RT 2 BOX 11
LITCHFIELD MN 55355