

CONTENTS

IN MEMORIAM: GILBERT A. SYDOW	John Lau
PAIDEIA:	
IS EDUCATION THE SOLUTION TO OUR PROBLEMS – OR IS THE SOLUTION OUR PROBLEM?	Gilbert A. Sydow
FROM A PASTOR'S AND PROFESSOR'S NOTEBOOK (continuation)	Roland A. Gurgel
EMPHASIS IN LUTHERAN AND REFORMED THEOLOGY	Vance Fossum

IN MEMORIAM: GILBERT A. SYDOW

“Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth; Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them” (Rev. 14:13).

On Wednesday, May 25, 1988, we learned that Pastor Gilbert Sydow had passed away that day at Lake Ridge Healthcare Center in Roseville, Minnesota. God had called to eternal rest another of those brethren who had been charter members of our Church of the Lutheran Confession and had served long and arduously in the tasks of organizing and up-building that needed to be done. We are surely grateful to God for having called this man to minister, both in the congregations which he served and in the wider fellowship of the CLC.

Gilbert Sydow was born in Rib Lake, Wisconsin, on September 19, 1914, and was baptized by his father, Pastor Arthur Sydow. After his confirmation, he attended Pacific Lutheran College in Tacoma, Washington, for his high school and first two years of college. In 1936 he graduated from Northwestern College, Watertown, Wisconsin; in 1939 he graduated from Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary, Mequon, Wisconsin.

From 1940 to 1959 Pastor Sydow served congregations of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod in its Pacific Northwest District, having first spent a year as tutor at Michigan Lutheran Seminary, Saginaw, Michigan. In 1960, having severed fellowship relations with the WELS because of that church body's false position regarding church fellowship, Pastor Sydow became a member of the CLC, serving St. Paul's Lutheran Church in Ellensburg, Washington, until 1965, when he accepted a call to Faith Lutheran Church, New Ulm, Minnesota, which he served until his retirement in 1979. In his retirement he served CLC congregations as vacancy pastor in Carlsbad, New Mexico; Opportunity, Washington; Detroit Lakes and Rochester, Minnesota.

In 1981 Pastor Sydow severed fellowship relations with the CLC because he differed from us in the application of our teaching (which he shared) that membership in fraternal insurance organizations, such as, Aid Association for Lutherans and Lutheran Brotherhood, is unionistic and contrary to Scriptural injunction (Rom. 16:17-18). He was instrumental in forming the LCCF (Lutheran Conference of

Confessional Fellowship), an association of four Lutheran congregations in southern Minnesota. However, near the end of his life, Pastor Sydow resigned his membership and fellowship with that group and rejoined the CLC, becoming a member of Grace Lutheran Church of Fridley, Minnesota.

Pastor Sydow served the CLC in various capacities during his active ministry. Included among these were: Board of Doctrine, Chairman of the Board of Regents of Immanuel Lutheran College, Business Manager of the CLC Book House, and Conference Visitor. The function in which he no doubt had the greatest impact was that of Editor of the Lutheran Spokesman, an official publication of our church body.

Gilbert Sydow was united in marriage with Ruth Schwartz on November 1, 1940. Their marriage was blessed with seven children and seventeen grandchildren. Pastor M. J. Witt preached the sermon at the funeral service which was held at Grace Lutheran Church, Fridley, Minnesota, on May 28, 1988. Pastor Daniel Fleischer conducted the service.

As a memorial to Pastor Gilbert Sydow, we thought it would be fitting to publish one of the essays written by this gifted student of the Word. The one selected, chosen by his son, Pastor Michael Sydow, properly belongs in our Paideia section.

John Lau

PAIDEIA

Is Education The Solution To Our Problems – Or Is The Solution Our Problem?*

Gilbert A. Sydow

* Originally presented at the CLC Teachers' Conference, October 18-20, 1972. —Editor.

Preamble This topic was presented to me as an essay assignment in August. With all the fall activity in the congregation coming to the fore, a time element for preparation entered in. But more of a problem lay in understanding what the topic really meant—just what was wanted. The Program Committee couldn't and didn't help too much on this. Somewhat with a smile they said, and I quote, "You're our choice to see what you want to do with that topic. Congratulations!" Some might be affronted at such vagueness, but I don't mind. It leaves the field wide open. But there is a risk in allowing such latitude, especially to me. To explain: periodically on Sunday afternoon I write a mimeographed family letter called The Green Sheet. On occasion, others in the family suggest that I put out another issue. When I express reluctance, saying that I have nothing to write, invariably comes the remark, "That never stopped you before." Or, as my daughter once said when I came up with a half-page effort, "I like it better when Dad doesn't say anything for a whole-page-worth." This is to give you some idea of what you might be in for. If you have misgivings, now is the time to call a halt.

Introduction Right at the outset we will have to get at definitions and try to put meaning and direction into the assignment.

We have the term "education" set in a relationship to "problems." Our first question has to do with the educational scene about which we are talking. Is the word used in the broad, general sense—education and related problems in the secular sense; or in the more specific sense—education and

problems in our own particular CLC Lutheran circle. Since this consideration arose within our own midst, and for our own use, we make this first assumption: that we are interested in these things as they pertain to our own CLC concerns, needs and purposes.

The term “solution” appears to be used in two different senses. The first apparently refers to an end result, a goal, and the second to method. Here the choice will make a great deal of difference in approach. Since, properly understood, our Christian education can and does indeed serve as a solution to our problems, and is really not debatable among us, at this writing the choice is made to deal with methodology.

And then, what problems are we talking about? Is it just the problems pertaining to the inculcation of knowledge, or is it those related to educating in the broad, full sense—the training of the whole man, knowledge, attitude, behavior—for us, the Christian character? Here we make another choice. We are going to deal with educational problems in the broad sense, and then only with a part of that—that which has to do with attitude and behavior. This is done because we are convinced that, where attitude and behavior is good, the imparting of knowledge is easy, or at least easier. (On this point my children have been consulted. Perhaps you know, six out of seven of them are, or will be, qualified teachers. We discuss education and much that goes with it a great deal among our selves. They agree that, where there are no attitude or behavior problems, the entire matter of teaching is quite easy and pleasant, and that, given this background, even the least gifted can be taught something.)

Dr. L. Salk, director of the Division of Pediatric Psychology at New York Hospital, on a TV interview, said something pertinent to this point:

The child whose parents have not really cared, have been inconsistent—that child is not going to be interested in doing much of anything that those people set up as limits. He is defiant, rebellious, he seems to be indifferent to the teachings of other people and finds it very difficult to move out into the world and do things in a socially acceptable way. When you put such a child in a school situation, he finds it extremely difficult to deal with the learning situation. He finds it very difficult to appreciate that which is offered in the educational environment.

Thus we come up with something like this: Is there perhaps a methodology particularly suited to our Christian approach that would reduce our attitude and behavior problems and, as a result, make our teaching easier and better? If it is felt that this is man-handling the topic assigned and goes far afield from what was intended, here again is a place to call a halt.

This could be somewhat of a research paper, but it won't. There really was not too much time for that, to hunt up, acquire and read materials that might have broadened the background and scope. But it also isn't so urgently necessary for what I have in mind. There is no intention to deal with the specific technology of classroom methodology in presenting lessons. I am not qualified to handle that matter, and, for this writing, it is not deemed necessary nor worth the time.

A few current items give evidence that classroom procedure is still in a highly experimental stage, and that past theories are being challenged again and again. *Time* (September 10, 1972) reviews a book, *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America*, by Harvard sociologist C. Jencks, in which the author is quoted as saying, “The character of a school's output depends largely on a single input, namely, the characteristics of the entering children,” and that is determined primarily by “heredity and home environment.” A *Reader's Digest* article (October 1972), “When Should Your Child Go To School,” questions the entire matter of early, formal classroom teaching and such programs as “Head Start”:

Advocates of early schooling usually start from the two well-proven points: the fact of incredibly rapid growth in a child's intelligence between birth and age five, and the need for the child's social development to keep pace with his intellectual maturity. But then they make unfortunate twin assumptions: that a child's intelligence can be nurtured by organizing it, and that brightness means readiness for the world of schooling. These assumptions, however comforting, are contradicted by clear-cut experimental evidence. A wealth of research has established that a child's primary needs in these formative years are for an environment free of tasks that will overtax his brain, and for a setting that provides warmth, continuity and security. Normal school experience does not meet these needs.

See also the *Lutheran Spokesman* (July 1972), "That They Might Learn."

We are going rather into that which pertains more to early parental handling of children at home, the preschool years. Where the desired Christian attitude and behavior have an early start, problems diminish and teaching becomes simpler. Obviously, this will not be directly pertinent to classroom activity and your immediate concern, but perhaps we can come up with something that will be of some interest to us both as parents and teachers.

Biblical Principles It hardly need be said among us that, as Christians in our Bible-bound sense of the word, we have a decided advantage as we go about the training and education of our children. For our purposes here we start with the fact of sin. We know and believe from Scripture, and our experience attests to it, that mankind is sinful—that we are sinners. Have we contemplated the wealth and the depth of knowledge and understanding that lies in this realization and admission? The world about us cries for relevance. There is nothing more relevant in this world than the fact of sin. That is why a Christian is a most practical and hard-headed realist. He is relieved of false hopes and aspirations, of chasing rain bows and kidding himself. When he talks of problems he knows their ultimate cause and source. This acknowledgment and comprehension that we are sinners dealing with sin is profound wisdom that has come to us through being enlightened in the salvation that lies in Jesus Christ.

And as Christians our advantage continues when it comes to dealing with sin. We are not at this time going into an in-depth study, or even much of a review, of God's grace showing itself in the redemption and justification prepared for sinners in Jesus Christ. But let it be well understood that this is our "not-without-which" from which all else proceeds. We work only from within the sacred circle so well expressed by Luther in the Third Article, "In which Christian Church He richly and daily forgives all sins to me and all believers."

And now, in the "washing of regeneration" of baptism our children not only receive this forgiveness of sins, but that blessed attendant thing, the God-created new creature in Christ, which responds to the promptings of the Holy Spirit as He works through the Word. In infancy, where there is immaturity of mind and a lack of intellectual grasping of the Means of Grace, it could be that the activity of the new man and what might be done with it is overlooked. Although this may be an unproven abstraction, we feel that the new man does respond to training that is godly, that is in keeping with the Word of God. Here we are not thinking of some mystical influence of the Gospel, but of procedures that come from Scripture and fit the old Adam-new man situation.

What is more, when it comes to the time of intellectual comprehension, we can speak to our children in terms of absolutes. We know from Scripture what is the godly attitude, what is the godly behavior. We are spared the weakness of speaking in terms of "This is my opinion;" "This is the consensus opinion;" "This is what the experts say." There is great authority and strength in being able to say, "Thus said the Lord;" "This is what your God says." There is nothing that takes greater hold of the conscience. Here lie the believers' assurance and stability.

And the same Scripture lays out for us the perfect child psychology when it says, “He that loveth his child, chasteneth him betimes” (Prov. 13:24, paraphrased). This is advice that is given in the sin-situation. The Lord, who “knoweth our frame” (Ps. 103:14) beyond what we can know or even learn of ourselves, tells us what will work in our kind of existence. Natural man, even within the limitations of being unregenerate, could profitably use this approach.

We have all this at our disposal and the clear and unquestioned assignment to “train up a child in the way he should go” (Prov. 22:6). In the New Testament the Apostle Paul puts it this way, “And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord” (Eph. 6:4). (“And, fathers, do not provoke your children to anger; but bring them up in the discipline and instruction of the Lord.” NASB) This is no take-it-or-leave-it proposition. A heavenly mandate is before us, and there is no escape from what it says.

In all this, basic doctrine is laid out for us. These various elements threaded together become the background from which we proceed, with all of them tightly interrelated and used collectively or separately as the occasion calls for. We agree in these underlying principles. And there has not been an ignoring or a breakdown in the teaching of these truths in our midst. But Scripture does not go very far into further detail; it does not give us a specific methodology for the varying occasions and experiences of life. On the basis of principle we are left much to our own devices to develop what is needful—a training methodology. The question is, “Have we given much attention and thought to it?” Have we backed away from seeking to devise procedures that fit with our principles because we hesitate to tell others how to raise their children? Is there here perhaps a vacuum, and our good Christian parents, although believing implicitly in the principles set forth and cheerfully willing to take on the assignment, being then left to their own resources, and perhaps without being aware of inconsistency, are turning to secular sources—McCalls and Good Housekeeping, Ann Landers and Dr. Spock—for answers to questions on child-training? And what they get for the most part does not fit the case, not only for Christian children, but for the world’s children, simply because sin and its forgiveness is not understood. The solution may indeed be our problem, not in principle, but in practice.

Something related to this point became apparent in an article appearing in Eternity (October 1972) in an article, “Let’s Lobby for the Family.” Some fine statements are made. St. Augustine is quoted: “The human family constitutes the beginning and the essential element of society . . . Peace in society must depend on peace in the family.” Also a certain G. Winter: “It . . . is obvious that a society without a strong, stable family was doomed . . . A healthy family is not an option for a society. It is a life and death matter.” After developing this thought, this is asked, “How will Christians react to these violent changes? What will the church’s response be?” The answer is made, “The church needs to turn to Scripture and discover what must be preserved in the family and what is expendable. It must make marriage and the family a priority emphasis in its ministry.” Well and good, but this is still generalization. And just saying we must turn to Scripture and must study Scripture doesn’t answer the proposition set forth above.

Practical Methods It is readily seen that going into methodology, which we admit is left up to our enlightened, Christian insight and understanding, brings us into the area of subjective opinion. This we cannot sidestep; but even so, is this not a worthwhile area of consideration where we can work at devising and developing practical procedures that fit our basic premises and work better because they are consistent with them? But then, it might be asked, “Who do you think you are? Are you a know-it-all who has all the answers when it comes to raising children?” Hardly! But the area of operation has been recognized and set apart and deliberate, conscious thought given to it, and the methods have been tried in the limited laboratory of one family, all from a deeply ingrained interest in children and a delight in handling them and seeing how they respond and develop under godly tutelage. The subjective

element, though it usually is not in good taste and at times is embarrassing, cannot be entirely avoided in this discussion. If we rule it out, we may as well stop right here, not only for now, but for all time. We will then be where we have been right along, preaching and teaching scriptural principle, with the practice thereof more or less hap hazard, without definition and direction. It would be admit ting, “There is no help!”

It could be proposed that, since this enters into the matter of opinion, one opinion is as good as another. This brings up the question whether within the scope of sanctification there can be a poor, fair, good, better, best. If we say that there is, and this is what I say, then it lies in method. We all agree in principle. There can be disparity here, even among sober, sensible, conscientious, well-instructed Christians. There are better ways of doing things. We have to warn ourselves about adopt ing the attitude that, since I am a Christian, well-informed on biblical principle, accepting without question the Bible as the Word of God and, in this particular instance, that Word which pertains to training children, whatever I now decide to do will be wise and right and good, as if somehow we instinctively know the best thing to do. In this there is high-minded arrogance. The first plea is to become aware of the area, acknowledge its existence, and then meditate upon it and develop a carefully thought-through methodology. It is rather questionable stewardship to approach the handling of our greatest gifts haphazardly. All this has not been said to erect a “straw man” to have something to knock down. It comes from observation. In watching how parents handle their children we have often wondered whether they have really given much thought to what they are doing.

1. The overlooked “provoke not.”

The Ephesians 6:4 passage is well known and commonly used among us, and yet the admonition to fathers, “provoke not to wrath,” tends to be overlooked. The words are spoken, they are known to exist, they are repeated, but often they are not really taken into account. When we deal with the concept of sin, we start with ourselves. That means in this instance, when problems arise, we do not begin with berating our children, but first ask, “What am I doing wrong?” This point was written about in an article, “There is Also This!” in the Lutheran Spokesman (June 1971) and received more than ordinary response, with laymen saying that the “provoke not” was never explained to them and a pastor of another synod admitting that he had never given much thought to the parental restraint there set forth. We quote from this article:

We have no trouble with “Children, obey your parents,” nor with “Honor thy father and mother,” and we readily agree with “Bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.” What is often passed over too quickly and given less attention is “Ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath.” And yet, this is the starting point for parents, their first consideration . . . There is no question that for the keeping of order in this sin-cursed world He (God) has established categories of authority and subjec tion. But wherever He grants authority, He is quick to add a word of caution: “Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church and gave himself for it;” “Ye masters . . . forbear threatening;” “Elders . . . neither as being lords over God’s heritage.” So also to fathers. From this it is quite in order to conclude that the Lord is not so much interested in establishing authority as He is in keeping order in a rebellious world.

The need for restraint upon those in authority is evident from Scripture also. The flesh is not only inclined to disobedience, it is also inclined to tyrannize. This has to do with what John calls “the pride of life,” which leads un regenerate man to covet “exercising lordship” over others, to play at being a petty dictator. The Lord knows very well what He is doing when He speaks a word of caution.

The question might arise, “Just what, in particular, does it mean to provoke to wrath? Are there examples?” We can speak only in terms of opinion, of judgment on what has been observed. There occur situations, even in Christian families, where sympathy belongs with the children because they

have been victimized by thoughtless handling. We adults should watch ourselves and examine whether, as we grow older, we tend to drift into arbitrary ways of dealing with the young. We have observed a tendency on the part of some to react with an immediate “No!” to the wishes and suggestions of children. It almost appears as if pride comes into the picture because the idea didn’t originate with the parents. This also has been observed that, at times of emotional stress and tension, aimless orders and directions are given to children. And yet, though they have not been well thought out, parental pride enters the picture, and, because instructions have been given, there is insistence that they be carried out. This is also seen that as adults we tend to force upon our children our own personal likes and dislikes, in music, in recreation, in styles and habits. So much so that, if one does not fall into our particular pattern of likes and dislikes, we lose the ability to evaluate fairly the whole person.

One might say that what is being advocated tends to undermine the arrangements of authority that God has established. But it is God Himself who has uttered the word of caution and established the restraint, lest the authority He has granted be abused. It also could be said that the burden of this matter lies with the obedience, with the Peter passage in mind (1 Pet. 2:18), “Be subject not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward.” Although in its immediate context the passage refers to a slave situation, its implications apply to all positions of subjection. With this we agree, but being froward, an overbearing teacher or parent, is not defended. This is a characteristic of the flesh. What Christian parent would want this, that the obedience of his children is, for the most part, dependent on the patience and long-suffering of the child, rather than on a cheerful willingness built upon a long-standing confidence in the thoughtful, godly concern behind the parental directive?

Here we make a slight digression and insert a few words about loving children. Among Christians, among ourselves, there is no question about this. We regard them as our greatest gift, next to faith itself. We have love for them both in terms of “*agapao*,” objective understanding and comprehension coupled with purpose, and “*phileo*,” subjective, emotional affection. Our questions would arise in connection with how this love is to be demonstrated. We go beyond the expression of love that lies in gladly providing for daily needs of food and shelter. Even here, love does not mean a providing that becomes indulgence, a giving of too much. Nor are we thinking of a love that shows itself in much emotional display of holding and kissing, and the giving of lavish gifts at birthdays and Christmas. This does not satisfy the basic need. It is a love that has time for children and reveals genuine interest in them as persons, in their life, and in what they are doing. It avoids at all cost giving the impression of interest and attention by condescension. Artificially contrived contact, as the once YMCA sponsored “Chiefs and Braves” program seeking to improve the father relationship, is of questionable value. A child becomes quickly aware of a “phony” love. It tells him that the parent isn’t honestly interested. What is done is done by way of duty. Should one say, “No time!”, there is only this answer, “Find time! Take time! You have nothing better to do.” This is not necessarily a matter of doing extra things but something that is woven into the pattern of everyday family life. Not so much a separate parental activity, but shared family fun. Above all, let the child know his worth, that his Lord thought so much of him that He suffered and died for him. Nothing tells us our value more than this, that the “Son of God loved me, and gave himself for me” (Gal. 2:21). In keeping with this, degradation and the breaking of spirit is avoided. In the good sense we leave the child his dignity, his value as a redeemed human being. (Examples: young banker who gave up all demanding civic activity to be with his four young sons during their crucial formative years; mother who tried to spend ten minutes alone with each child every day; overcoming out-of-sorts behavior with a little special attention.)

2. The best time to inculcate the basic attitude.

A man once said to me that I ought to write a book on how to handle teen-agers. My answer was that I didn’t know a thing about handling teen-agers. I wouldn’t know what to do if one of my sons had

ever told me in effect to “jump in the lake.” I have never had that experience. If we have arrived at the point of teen-age “problem,” where our children need “handling” in the dire sense of the word, although exceptions are granted, for the most part, in my opinion, we are dealing with a failure in previous training. We are in rehabilitation, an effort to instill an attitude and behavior that was missed earlier. And this is the most difficult time to do it.

My maternal grandfather was for some forty years the superintendent of the Milwaukee County Children’s Home. When I was in the seminary, he once told me, speaking from his experience, that the best training of children is done before they are three years old. He had no statistical research to back this up, but I believed him, and I still do. A good share of what your child will be in later life in terms of attitude and behavior is implanted in these very early years. This was taken into account in our family.

There might be skepticism that much can be done in the earliest years before there is communication by speech and mental comprehension. But I am sure that none of us doubts that infants can be trained. The question, perhaps, would be: just how much can be done? It is here that possibilities may be overlooked.

As said before, we should be keenly aware of just what we have on our hands. This beautiful, darling, innocent-looking child of mine is in the flesh an imp of Satan, disobedient, rebellious, a self-willed, self-centered, selfish ego-maniac. Like a wild stallion, he has to be broken to bit and saddle. How might this be done?

Sometimes such Bible-oriented people as ourselves become know-it-alls. We get to the point where we think we can learn nothing from the world. In our conservative stance we shouldn’t be fearful of giving consideration to what man is doing and so closed-minded as not to give attention to what the world is learning about itself. We do this in the spirit of “prove all things; hold fast that which is good” (1 Thess. 5:21), that which fits our beliefs and biblical doctrine.

Almost everyone has heard of Pavlov and his bell, his dog, the saliva, and the conditioned reflex. Most likely, even if Pavlov had never made his experiments, or whether we had ever heard of them, the conditioned reflex would still be with us. It is a quite normal and natural reaction. But he worked with it, identified, named and made us aware of it.

In the training of infants the conditioned reflex is a handy device. We made use of it, and we did so consciously, seeking to accomplish a Christian objective. An infant for the most part gets its way by crying. We reasoned that this could be conditioned out of a child. The method was simply not to respond to crying, after, of course, first determining that nothing physical was wrong. There was no picking up. Tears did not bring attention. It worked. The result was not just great ease in handling an infant but, in my opinion, one of the key procedures that ingrained deeply into the psyche of the child that it couldn’t have its own way. This was the beginning of something so vital to “love thy neighbor;” to live with others you must adjust. (The behavior of our infants was noticeably different. Example: elderly woman, when asked how come our babies would lie quietly in a basket smiling, “Dey train dem dat vay. Dey pick dem up ven dey smile instead of ven dey cry.”)

As a follow-up to this procedure, in the early years the word “No!” was not tolerated in response to a request of the parent. And no gesture of resentment or defiance, even a supposed playful slap, was permitted. (“It’s so cute, you know.”) And a display of emotion that came from not getting one’s way brought something to cry about. Temper tantrums did not arise. A pan of cold water ended the only one that appeared to be developing. We firmly believe that insisting on obedience had a strong bearing on later attitude and behavior. To disagree or disobey was never very much in the picture. (Example: witnessing the nightly ordeal of parents putting their children to bed; never a problem, rather a “fun

time.”)

My children now refer to those early years as a “benevolent dictatorship,” and so it was. But I believe it has to come to an end when children enter the teens. Then comes a change in method and approach. We lead and guide with good-humored suggestion, by all means avoiding head-to-head confrontations. Outright sin, of course, is handled in love with a heavy hand. When children are feeling their way into adulthood and maturity, a good measure of decision making has to be left up to them. This is all part of making them responsible people. Here we should and we can begin to reap the results of what has been so deeply ingrained in the earlier years. Trust enters the picture. It has to. The godly life has been taught. The maturing process calls for living it without the policing of others. The pattern proposed is this: a heavy-handed discipline in the very early years; an easing off later on. We think that, perhaps, part of our trouble, our problems, comes from this being turned around—letting things go in the early years, and then trying to clamp down later. It doesn’t work too well.

Another incidental item comes to mind which has a bearing on attitude and behavior. In an effort to teach respect for other people’s property, we did not permit our children to play in or take short-cuts through other people’s yards, unless they were playing with the children of the household. How would you like to live next door to a family with seven healthy, lively youngsters only too eager to trample your flower beds and wear out your lawn? It is my observation in dealing with the playing and the damage that is done by neighborhood children on our parsonage and church property that respect for other people’s property is a forgotten concept. Think of what this will lead to in later life. Ecology comes under Christian stewardship, in particular, that which Luther enjoins in the Seventh Commandment, “. . . but help him to improve and protect his property and business.”

3. Husband and wife decisions.

In speaking about the crucial time to make the major effort in establishing attitude and behavior patterns, what was not said in so many words is that whatever is done must be the joint effort of both husband and wife. They must agree and mutually support one another. We wish to go into this a bit further—that husband and wife think carefully about child training procedures, openly discuss them between themselves, and arrive at agreed conclusions on what is to be done.

One of the first things to be set up is a consistent pattern of expected behavior, not just in the moral sense, but for family order also. This is to be done so that the confusion and in decision of momentary and fragmented directives is avoided. Too often these come from stirred-up emotion, pressure-tension situations, frustration and exasperation, not from quiet meditation and careful thought. The questions to ask oneself are: Is this a reasonable expectation? Is this what we really want our child to do? Once a policy has been established and made know, it then is to be upheld with strong consistency and a swift and sure punitive response to disobedience. To me this brings about a wholesome, steady and stabilizing influence. The child always knew what was expected and what to expect—just where it was. And it was not taxed to make choices and decisions beyond its age-capability. This makes for a happy and contented child.

For us it was also a definite decision that the mother would emphasize the “tender love and care,” the father the heavy discipline. Obviously, this is the godly way. And it fits into the very physical nature of the creation of male and female, as God intended. However, we do not think of these as mutually exclusive activities. The mother does disciplining, the mild and momentary kind; the father shows tender love and care, much of it. But in the family structure it is well that the child knows that behind everything is the rule (and ruler) of the father, which at times has a sternness and harshness attached to it. Some may question the delay of dealing with a specific matter until the father is around to handle it. This may vary, but we still think it good that a child, especially under instances of serious disobedience, knows that it

will have to deal with the father. Some would argue that this will turn the child's affection from the father to the mother. It simply does not go that way. This arrangement is of God's devising, and, when husband and wife carry out their godly role as parents, jealousy and vying for the child's affection does not arise.

A cardinal rule for parents is that they never undermine each other's directives in the presence of the children. This only confuses and bewilders the children and undermines family stability. Rather, straighten things out in private, correcting in each other what might need correcting, changing family policy if necessary, but always standing before the children in mutual agreement, supporting each other in what is done.

The Bible speaks of "natural affection." This has to be strong in Christians. The new man in Christ loves children. Of this there is no question. And yet, we have to take care, lest we turn this love into something it is not to be, that the emotion and sentiment of the flesh turn a misconstrued love into a weakness. Godly love does not overlook weaknesses and faults. Since the overlooking of faults in our children is a natural tendency, a conscious decision should be made with this in mind, that, if we really are to help our children to grow up into Christian maturity, then we must alert ourselves to recognize weaknesses and failings. Only when we are aware of them, admit them, will we be able to help.

If all this sounds as if family life should and would be very pompous and solemn and serious, it is not intended that way. As this was carried out in our family, living was some what of a hilarious affair. Of all people, Christians can laugh. The burden of sin is removed in faith. Rejoicing and being cheerful is our lot. And in our liberty and freedom under the Gospel, laughter can well extend into these matters of daily life. In the training of children, a sense of humor, a smile, the light touch, the good-natured approach is to be preferred. It is used in the sense implied in the statement, "Speak softly, but carry a big stick." Behind everything is the "standing in awe" of God's holy Word.

We bring this writing to a rather abrupt close. Much that has been written, especially in the last pages, is of human opinion and thus debatable. Perhaps it should be further explained or qualified. What we have sought to do is enter into an area where there has been silence among us, where perhaps something could and should be said. Some may say that not all can do what is here advocated. Indeed, there is a diversity of gifts among us, but could not those of the more perceptive and reflexive turn of mind offer something to the others? We do this in other areas.

All this that God may be gloried in our children!

From a Pastor's and Professor's Notebook

Roland A. Gurgel

IV

Prophecy Number 4: Numbers 24:15-24

Balak gives up on Balaam. Three times he had waited for Balaam to pronounce a curse upon the children of Israel, and three times he had heard words of blessing. Balak's problem was that he did not hear those words of blessing as being an accurate description of Israel's condition under God's protection. He did not want those words to be true; as a result, for him they were not.

In anger Balak turned on Balaam and ordered him to be gone. Numbers 24:10-11a: "By listening

to the Lord you have forfeited wealth and honor. If you had hearkened to me, all this wealth and position would be yours.” An advance echo in some ways of a scene to come hundreds of years later: “All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me” (Matt. 4:9). But Jesus’ reply to Satan on that occasion was quite different from that of Balaam to Balak. The Lord Jesus said, “Get thee hence, Satan, for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve” (Matt. 4:10).

The Savior in loving obedience willingly followed the direction of his heavenly Father. Not so Balaam. By contrast, he followed the direction of God—not with a willing service, but by constraint. Recall the original dealings of God with Balaam (Numbers 22). “I cannot go beyond the commandment of the Lord, to do either good or bad of mine own mind . . .” (Num. 24:13). His are the actions of fear and not a willing, loving worship. Again we would direct your attention to Numbers 31:16: “. . . these caused the children of Israel, **through the counsel of Balaam**, to commit trespass . . .” Confer also Revelation 2:14 and 2 Peter 2:15.

NOTE : The world constantly holds out the promise that, if one listens to and follows its way, wealth and honor will come in great measure. We need to be reminded again and again that, if we look to the world and its ways as the source of good, we will find ourselves with empty cisterns (Jer. 2:13).

Balak wanted no more prophecies, no more words from Balaam. But he should have come with questions—questions raised by the three prophecies. Although Balak did not ask them, the Lord answered the unasked questions—answered them, not only for Balak, but also for God’s people who would read of and hear about the words of Balaam to Balak.

The first question that **should have come** to the mind of Balak and very decidedly **would come** to the mind of the Israelites is: Where is this King you have spoken so highly of in the second and third prophecies? I see no King in Israel’s camp. Moses I know of, but he is never called a king by his people or by God. He is designated a prophet, a leader, but never a king. Where is this King?

The second question that might well have been asked by Balak is this: If the Lord will not curse Israel, if under His gracious care they will prosper, what is to become of Moab, Edom, and the other people who are found in this territory?

The fourth prophecy that God put on the lips of Balaam answered these two questions. The first—who is, where is this King spoken of in the second and third prophecies—is of utmost importance for people of all times and all places. Who is this King and where is this King who covers the sins of His people—this King who is higher than Agog?

The Lord’s answer came in Number 24:17a and b. The King who is here (second and third prophecies), **but unseen**, is coming (—not now—not nigh—) **to be seen**; He is coming from the descendants of Jacob, from the people of Israel. So the Lord focused attention on Israel. Keep your eyes on these people—keep your eyes on them to watch for the coming into the flesh of that King who, in the days of Balaam and Balak, **was found unseen** but **giving evidence of Himself in the “camp of Israel.”** Of course, the reference is to the birth of Jesus in the manger at Bethlehem. Wait and watch is the admonition to the people of Old Testament times; wait and watch for the fullness of time (Gal. 4:4).

The second question, “. . . what this people shall do to thy people . . .” (Num. 24:14) is answered in the second half of verse 17 of Numbers 24. The King “shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth.” The same was to be true for other peoples of the area (Num. 24:18-24).

As is so often the case with prophecy, there is here, too, an immediate, temporal situation pictured

as well as a more remote, spiritual implication. The immediate, temporal fulfillment was found in the take-over of the lands by the armies of Israel under the leadership of the “captain of the host of the Lord” (Josh. 5:13-15). This part of the prophecy reached its fulfillment step by step until, in the days of David and Solomon, Israel held sway over the lands from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates. (Cf. Gen. 15:18-21.) For Israel of Old Testament times there was a very definite “temporal, earthly, promised land.” But! This land was given by their King to them as the land, the place, where in the fullness of time He would be born, live, die, and rise again: a temporal place with a great spiritual significance!

There is the promise in these verses of another kind of “take-over” of Moab, etc., by the King who was there and who was to come. That King wanted to take over the hearts and lives of these people as well as their lands. He extended an invitation four times to Balak to find in Him a gracious Lord and King who would bless and keep him, Balak, in time and point him to the death of the righteous for entrance into the eternal tents of God’s people. Balak refused the invitation and, as a result, ended up in eternal, spiritual disaster.

However, there were individuals from Moab and the other lands who became a part of the King’s people. Think of Ruth—“Thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God” (Ruth 1:16c).

It was a prime function of Israel to hold their “**present**”—“**coming**” King before the eyes of the world of their day in order that people of all lands might be brought under His gracious rule. Where that invitation was accepted came blessing; where it was rejected came judgment—the savour of life unto life and of death unto death, as St. Paul writes in 2 Corinthians 2:14-16.

The temporal implication of the fourth prophecy no longer applies in the New Testament era. Christ has come, born in Palestine. That land served its God-given purpose. The King does still reach out to all peoples of all places, to find in Him their gracious and powerful Lord. To make His name known is our God-given function in this day of the New Testament era. May we ever be busy about that work with grateful and loving zeal.

This prophecy is very clearly an Advent prophecy. It might well serve as the text for the first Sunday in Advent. Using the words of the familiar Gospel Lesson for that Sunday as a theme:

Behold, Thy King Cometh Unto Thee!

- I Who is this King? (The answer: the King who is here, who is to come, who came, who is coming.)
- II What does He seek? (To rule, not only in your heart, but in the hearts of all people.)

For the second Sunday in Advent you might use the second prophecy, Numbers 23:18-24:

Theme : What Hath God, Our King, Wrought?

- I He hath not beheld iniquity in Jacob.
- II There is no enchantment against Jacob.
- III The people shall rise up as a great lion.

The third prophecy may well serve as a text for the third Sunday in Advent (Num. 24:1-9).

Theme: Who Is Like To This King?

- I In gifts given.
- II In subjects won.
- III In power provided.

And finally, for the fourth Sunday in Advent, the first prophecy is in place (Num. 23:8-10).

Theme: The King Returns One Last Time.

- I To gather His special nation from a life of gracious blessings in time,
- II To provide His special nation with a life of eternal blessings beyond the grave.

Certainly there are many other occasions when one can use these prophecies for a series of texts or use one or another of them alone, but the reference to the King so clearly stated in three of them does suggest an Advent connection.

Luther once said of the first Psalm that it was like a little Bible in itself. The same can well be said for these four prophecies the Lord put on the lips of Balaam. What an insight they provide into God's relationship with His Church. May they be a source of comfort, guidance and joy to you as you await "the death of the righteous."

(To be continued)

EMPHASIS IN LUTHERAN AND REFORMED THEOLOGY

Vance Fossum

I.

The Problem Defined

Emphasis is one of those neutral words—standing alone it is neither good nor bad. Yet emphasis is useless by itself. Some thing must be emphasized. It is here that we can get ourselves into trouble in every area of life.

God was the first to use emphasis: "Of EVERY tree of the garden you may freely eat." Satan was next. It is the prohibition of God rather than the permission of God which he caused to "stand out" in his first words to Eve. Arguably, Eve also emphasized the prohibition of God in her response to Satan by dropping the word "every" from God's gracious permission and by expanding the prohibition with the words, "neither shall you touch it."

Without question, man can run no greater risk in the use of emphasis than when he is dealing with the Word of God. This is true, I believe, first, because of the paradoxical nature of Christian theology and,

second, because of the nature of man.

The Paradoxical Nature of Christian Theology The fruits reveal the roots. The paradoxical nature of Christian experience is the inevitable outgrowth of the paradoxical nature of Christian theology.

The apostle describes his experience:

. . . hard pressed . . . yet not crushed; . . . perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; struck down, but not destroyed; always carrying about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life of Jesus also may be manifested in our body. For we who live are always delivered to death for Jesus' sake, that the life of Jesus also may be manifested in our mortal flesh . . . (2 Cor. 4:7-12)

This wonderful, yet paradoxical out-working of Paul's faith-life, which parallels our own Christian experience, is rooted in such seemingly contradictory teachings as the following: God is three persons, yet one in substance; Jesus Christ is true God and true Man, yet one person; as such He is equal with God the Father, yet the Father is "greater" than He is; God is all-powerful and desires "all men to be saved," yet He is resisted by man and all are not saved; God truly elected some from eternity to be saved, but He did not thereby predestine the remainder to damnation; the Christian is at all times both sinner and saint; we are complete in Jesus Christ by faith and perfect before God, yet we are not "perfected" in this life; we have ever lasting life, yet we have not "attained" that blessed goal for which Christ has "laid hold of us." We could go on and on with such examples.

One does not have to study the history of the New Testament Church very long before recognizing the danger in emphasizing one half of a paradox over against the other half. Arius could not emphasize the distinction in persons between the Father and the Son without doing violence to the scriptural truth of the substantial unity of the Godhead. The "Adoptionist" heresy arose in Spain when Elipandus of Toledo (c. AD 780) and Felix of Urgel emphasized the human nature of Christ over the divine. It was John Calvin's emphasis of one divine attribute—the sovereignty of God—which led him and others after him to deny another attribute of God—His universal grace and love. Any emphasis which violates, diminishes, or destroys a paradox of Christian truth is an assault against the Word of God and a toxin to saving faith which thrives only on the paradoxical Word.

The Anthropocentric Nature of Man As stated, the second factor which makes emphasis in the area of theology risky business is the nature of man. If already in Paradise Eve was inclined to emphasize the material and the sensual as Satan prodded her to take of the forbidden fruit, then what of fallen man? Does he not begin with the severest of handicaps when it comes to receiving, understanding, and applying the Word of God rightly? Man is born into this world with a natural inclination in only one direction—away from God (Rom. 8:7).

What, then, shall be the ground, the starting point, yes, the reason for his emphasis in spiritual matters? If she who was perfect, whose reason was fully "in the light," who was in full fellowship with God, still sought to approach God—to be equal with God—by setting aside His Word and setting forth her own reasoning will, then what must we expect of the fallen race? Surely he who lost the image of his God, who has been plunged into the fearful darkness of sin, and who senses the loss of fellowship with God, sees no one but himself, trusts nothing but his own reason and strength, and so looks to no one but him self for deliverance from sin's condemnation. His emphasis in all spiritual matters is ANTHROPOCENTRIC rather than THEOCENTRIC.

Is it too much to say that there is "none who seeks God"? Think about it. Eve wanted to be equal with God. Fallen man wants to be his own God, or he wants no God at all. He "holds down the truth"

about God which he may know from creation, namely, that God is eternal and powerful and good. Man rather thinks himself “wise” while removing all doubt that he is in fact a “fool,” worshiping man and other created things rather than the Creator, who IS GOD, blessed forever! (Rom. 1:18ff).

If man totally denies the existence of God as a supreme and spiritual being, his anthropocentricity takes the form of atheistic materialism in which he gives himself and finally IS GIVEN UP to the unrestrained pursuit of what appears to be gratifying or feels good to his fleshly senses. This is the growing blight upon our own nation, which, thinking itself wise in the pursuit of “knowledge” above all else, has taken of the forbidden fruit from the tree of evolution and even swallowed the entire tree! Recapitulating the sin of Eve, in a sense, our nation is also suffering a curse from God because it has pursued “know ledge” rather than the wisdom which begins with “the fear of the Lord.” The student of Scripture will be readily aware of this by comparing the growing homosexual perversion and its consequences “in themselves” (*en heautois*) with Romans 1:26-27.

Emphasis in Natural Religion What, then, of those who do not deny their natural reason, but acknowledge the existence and activity of God as Creator, following the lead of conscience and the visible evidence of creation? One might think that in their approach to God and spiritual matters the emphasis would be centered in God, not man. But this is not the case, despite all appearances. For “natural religion,” with its self-prescribed rituals, devotions, and sacrifices, asks for no mercy from God, no love, no un earned help or forgiveness. It exists and persists on the notion that what separates a person from God “is not of a qualitative but merely of a quantitative nature.”¹ One who holds to such religion naturally looks to himself, emphasizing his own ability to close the gap between himself and God by a greater exertion of his own will, by a more extensive purification of his feelings, and by perfecting his reasonable spirit through the increase of knowledge and the exercise of the mind. Adolph Köberle put it this way:

The sanctification of conduct by the strengthening of the will; the sanctification of the emotions by a strenuous training of the soul; the sanctification of thought by a deepening of the understanding; moralism, mysticism, speculation, these are the three ladders on which men continually seek to climb up to God, with a persistent purpose that it seems nothing can check; a storming of Heaven that is just as pathetic in its unceasing efforts as in its final futility.²

It is the nature of the religious man, therefore, to emphasize his own responsibility and ability in reconciling him self to God—more of the human will, emotions, and knowledge—the difference between God and man being strictly quantitative. Unconverted, natural man cannot begin to understand, accept, and apply the emphasis of Holy Scripture that the difference between God and man is qualitative and that what is needed is not more of, but OTHER THAN man’s will-power, feelings, and knowledge.

Natural man reasons that he needs only to exercise and develop his innate spirituality, fan the divine spark of goodness within; but Scripture declares unconverted man to be utterly “dead in trespasses and sins” (Eph. 2:1-3), a spiritual corpse un able to lift a finger to help himself, sitting in darkness and captive to the prince of darkness, born of corruptible seed (1 Pet. 1:23), totally unable to please God (Rom. 8:8), and a slave of sin (Rom. 6:17). What is needed, then, is not more dead works of the law, but works of the Spirit; not more dark ness, but light; not a nurturing and development of “corruptible seed,” but the implanting of the “incorruptible Seed” which is the Word of God; not more slavery to sin, but freedom and righteousness in and by that OTHER Man, Jesus Christ.

The Great Encounter Now, let us see very clearly how great the problem of emphasis in regard to the Word of God is when the paradoxical nature of that Word confronts the fallen nature of man. Consider the “head-scratching” encounter of the “Word made flesh” with Nicodemus.

Jesus confronts Nicodemus with the most important paradoxical word of all—the mountain which must be climbed first, before other Christian paradoxes can be seen as truth on the highest plain: “Unless one is born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God” (John 3:5). Nicodemus is a “teacher of Israel,” but he is totally unable to grasp the paradox that, although living he is not yet alive, although having been born he must be “born again.” The ensuing words of our Lord reveal that, left to himself, neither Nicodemus nor any other person can set aside his anthropocentric, natural theology to recognize the saving truth that salvation is in God, not man, and comes not by reason or strength of man, but by faith and divine grace in Christ alone.

The reason of natural man, resting as it does so heavily upon human pride, must be pressed down and made subject to Christ’s Word right here at this point first, and then at every other point of the paradoxical Word. Only then can even the converted man apply emphasis properly—theocentrically—in his dealing with God’s Word.

II.

Wrong Emphasis Sanctioned By The Church Of Rome

The theology of the apostles and the early Church was obviously theocentric. But even then there were some, “Judaizers,” who sought to drag the Galatian Christians back under bondage to circumcision and the observance of the Jewish sabbath. There were also “Gnostics” who attempted to introduce a self-redeeming system among the Colossians. They taught the ascent of man to God by means of a deeper knowledge of God revealed to them directly by God (cf. Paul’s emphasis on the knowledge of God possessed by faith in Christ, Col. 1:9-10, 2:1-3, with his warning in 2:8-10). These errorists also emphasized the importance of circumcision and the other aspects of Jewish ceremonial law (Col. 2:11-17), adding to this an element of ascetic abstinence which even seems to have surpassed the devotion of Jewry (2:18-23).

The Danger Of The “Somethings” The supremely dangerous threat to the confession of the New Testament Church and the faith of the Christian has never been the pagan religious systems of the world which promote the worship of gods unable to see, hear, or do—gods which are not. The greatest threat has come from any system of theology which presents itself as Christian, yet, like those early Judaizers and Gnostics, prescribes this or that exercise of human will (moralism), feeling (asceticism), or reason (speculation) in addition to the Gospel of Grace. The danger lies not so much in this that Christ is opposed in the world by pagan NOTHINGS; but in this, that to Christ is added man’s SOMETHINGS. The paradox here is that nothing can be added to Christ in regard to the sinner’s salvation without taking Christ away from him! For those who attempt to be justified by law-works “have become estranged from Christ,” “fallen from grace” (Gal. 5:4). If this seems obvious to us, then God be praised! But let us never cease to pray fervently that we shall always be alert to our own proclivity and Satan’s constant prodding in the direction of a theology which suggests that acceptance before God consists in something of man in addition to that COMPLETENESS which belongs to faith in Christ (Col. 2:9, 1 Cor. 1:30).

We need to be reminded again and again that, especially in those times when the external church is not being threatened by pagan hostility, the devil is working and threatening from within. In those days when there were no “gods,” but only God, Satan was not so foolish as to suggest that Eve might better herself spiritually by bowing down to a tree or a stone out side the Garden; rather he sought to convince her that she could improve upon the life, wisdom, and joy she already possessed—indeed, she could actually get closer to God—by ADDING “the knowledge of good and evil.” Satan’s continuous emphasis within the “garden” of the church is designed to lead people away from God and His Christ without setting off an alarm and awakening them to the truth that they are being led by the devil, not closer to God, but away from Him.

A Church In And “Of” The World

That great “mystery of iniquity” of which Paul warned the Thessalonians that it was “already at work” (2 Thess. 2), is called *ANTICHRISTOS* by John in his first epistle. It is clear from Paul’s description in 2 Thessalonians 2, that this “spirit,” this institution, is not called “anti-Christ” because it would arise from outside the external Christian church—it is not a threat of pagan hostility against the Church, nor a warning concerning some political ruler. The “ANTICHRIST” has manifested itself in the Roman Catholic papacy, and the antichristian spirit is evident in their Christ + man, faith + works system. This unpopular term, “Anti-Christ,” must be applied to the Roman-papal system for the simple reason that it does not appear to be against Christ at all, rather for Him!

Yet in point of fact, there is no system of theology in the history of the New Testament Church which adds more “SOMETHINGS” of man to the grace of God in Christ. The commission Christ gave the Church to act as “salt” and “light” in the world necessarily meant that the Church be in the world, but not OF the world. She was to go forth making disciples of all nations. She was to share the pure Water of Life, not soak up the polluted streams of human reason and religiosity.

But with the establishment of Christianity as THE religion of the empire by the edict of Constantine (c. AD 315), the external church took on the character of a giant sponge! Hundreds of thousands of pagans were absorbed into the church of the empire with little or no Christian instruction—the church grew, not because of the sword of Christ’s Spirit alone, but with the “helping” hand of man’s sword. Many of the anthropocentric emphases of pagan worship were assimilated by the church and “christianized.” Constantine, the first “Caesaro-Papist,” pursued a policy which assumed that all the subjects of the empire were Christians, just as those of the Old Testament theocracy were Israelites. This allusion to the theocracy of the Israelites combined with the importance of the sacrificing priesthood among the pagans to ADD the mediation and sacrifices of an ordained priesthood to the mediation and sacrifice of Christ, our great High Priest.

The “SOMETHINGS” of the Gnostics were also added to Christ by the church. One of the reasons Gnosticism died out by the fifth century is that the Roman Church absorbed some of its chief beliefs. The Gnostic emphasis on impressive external ceremonies probably led to the elaborate liturgical services in the Catholic Church and perhaps also the extra sacraments. The Gnostic contempt for matter and their emphasis on the evil nature of the body was taken up and “Christianized” in the ascetic self-denial and punishment of the body practiced by the monastic orders. Surely the belief of the Gnostics that there were many beings between the “Unknown God” and man contributed to the Roman Catholic addition of the veneration of the saints.

The Grace + Works System

The “Empire Church” of Rome could not soak up the reasoning and religions of the world without adding man’s activity and will to God’s and so developing a grace + works system. While allowing that in Roman Catholicism there is a “consciousness” of the weakness of human will, Adolf Köberle adds that the main emphasis still lies on man’s own work throughout the Roman system:

Man is to do all that he can and then God supplies what is lacking by grace, as if it were possible to determine the exact maximum that each one was able to supply. Everything in Romanism indicates that it must be included in this classification. . . . The religion of quantitative accomplishments, that surge up from below to heights approaching Heaven; the idea of the monk who brings the “great obedience” as a sacrifice to God and therefore progresses toward perfection more rapidly and more surely than the one who is engaged in some secular vocation; the distinction between mortal and venial sins that constitute a greater or lesser hindrance on the “way” to God; the opinion, bordering on blasphemy, of the supererogatory works of the saints that gathered like a gigantic treasure are

placed at the disposal of the Church; the teaching of the veneration of the saints that has been so evilly distorted through the idea of merits and rewards; the purpose of the mass where the gift of the redemptive work of Christ is turned into a human work that man offers God, all these opinions, that have even influenced the Protestant Church in a weakened form and have produced a certain neopietistic, vulgar Protestantism, can only receive such great significance in those quarters where self-sanctification by human works is positively affirmed as a presupposition, taken for granted.³

All these “opinions” arose from the reasoning will of natural man and were fostered by the emphasis placed on natural reason in the various “schools” of the Roman Church. These schools added the methods of Aristotle and company to the rule of faith in dealing with the revelation of God in Holy Scripture. However, as Köberle states so pointedly, these opinions “can only receive such great significance in those quarters where self-sanctification by human works is positively affirmed as a presupposition, taken for granted.” This, of course, is THE presupposition of natural man wherever he is—outside the church or within. “If only we can come to God with full hands and not with those that are quite empty, if only we may give some thing ourselves out of the abundance of our own willing and knowing and being.”⁴

The Weakened Will But the common basis for all such attempts to approach God and lay hold of salvation is the stubborn insistence on the part of man that his will is not evil and does not totally separate him from God. The idea that man sanctifies himself by the exercise of a moral will—not dead, but alive—was “positively affirmed” and sanctioned by the Roman Church when it com promised the grace of God in Christ with the anthropocentric theology of Pelagius (AD 370-440).

Pelagius taught that man did not inherit original sin from Adam. Sin is rather a matter of the will, not of a fallen and corrupt nature. Each man, according to Pelagius, is created like Adam with a perfectly free will to choose and do good or evil. Therefore, it is possible for man to lead an entirely sinless life and save himself by his own good works. Because man has no original or inherited sin, according to this view, neither is it necessary to baptize new-born children, although Pelagius did not deny baptism as a means of regeneration as he defined it.

The Pelagians contended that infants “are baptized, that by regeneration they may be admitted to the kingdom of God, being thereby transferred from what is good to what is better, not that by that renewal they were set free from any evil of the old obligation. If children were unbaptized, they would have, indeed, a place out of the kingdom of God, yet nevertheless, a blessed and eternal life,” in virtue of their innocence.⁵

Let it be sufficient to note here that these and other errors of Pelagius were opposed by Augustine and officially by the Roman Church in its later councils. But the heresy was by no means removed from the church; rather, the Roman Church sprinkled a little “prevenient grace” into the Pelagian pot and indulged the appetite of human nature. “The Roman church praises Augustine and follows Pelagius” to this day.

III.

Wrong Emphasis Continued Among The Reformed

Now we are approaching the point in this essay where we shall mark the chief distinction of emphasis between Lutheran and Reformed theology. In 1525 Luther wrote his classic, *De Servo Arbitrio* (The Bondage of the Will), in response to the work of Erasmus of Rotterdam, *Διατριβη De Libero Arbitrio* (1524). Erasmus was a semi-Pelagianist and the foremost rationalist and scholar of the period.

No one in the Church of Rome was better qualified to “wear out” by lengthy treatise the prevailing theological emphasis of Catholicism—the freedom of the human will to choose good and reject evil and so merit God’s favor.

The Root Cause Luther’s attack on the basis of Scripture and devastating logic was so intensely and thoroughly carried out in his lengthy response to Erasmus because it was just here, on this issue of free will vs. enslaved will—merit vs. grace alone—that the whole issue of the Reformation really turned. Compared to this central error of Catholicism, all the other errors, as offensive and damaging to poor sinners as they were, could not compare. They were merely the branches of an ugly tree, while the teaching that man is able to help himself to God by the activity of a free will was the root system. That Martin Luther regarded this as the main tar get of the Spirit’s sword against the Roman Church is evident by his closing remarks to Erasmus:

. . . I give you praise, and proclaim it—you alone in pre- eminent distinction from all others, have entered upon the thing itself; that is, the grand turning point of the cause; and, have not wearied me with those irrelevant points about popery, indulgences, and other baubles, rather than causes, with which all have hitherto tried to hunt me down— though all in vain! You, and you alone, saw what was the grand hinge upon which the whole turned, and therefore you attacked the vital part at once; for which, from my heart, I thank you. For in this kind of discussion I willingly engage, as far as time and leisure permit me. Had those who have heretofore attacked me done the same, and would those still do the same, who are now boasting of new spirits and new revelations, we should have less sedition and sectarianism, and more peace and concord.⁶

Baubles And Branches We see here that Luther bemoaned the fact that his original attackers, the Romanists, did not come to the point at issue, that he was so fiercely condemned because of his opposition to the “baubles,” or treasures of the Roman institution, when a calm debate of the real issue on the basis of Scripture might have led to peace and unity in the Roman Church. But Luther referred also to more recent attackers, those “boasting of new spirits and new revelations,” who were increasing the “sedition and sectarianism” of the times. These, too, were focusing their attention on the “baubles” of Romanism, rather than on the semi-Pelagian error which denied the total corruption of the human will, while asserting the moral responsibility of man in regard to his salvation. Who were Luther’s new opponents?

Time and space will not allow us to deal with the details of the abuses and fanaticism to which Luther referred and which disturbed the Lutheran Reformation, beginning from the years 1522-1525. We offer a summary listing: the iconoclastic measures of Carlstadt and his rejection of the “real presence” in the Lord’s Supper; the fanatical spirit of the “Zwickau Prophets,” popularized by the preaching of Thomas Münzer, who claimed that the direct revelation of the Spirit should be the guiding principle of the Reformation rather than the “letter” of the Scriptures; the Peasants’ War (1525), encouraged by the preaching of Münzer; the “other spirit” of Ulrich Zwingli; the formation of the Anabaptist sect, and so on.

Almost without exception, every radical movement from this period on was as superficial as it was zealous in its reform measures—“superficial,” because the emphasis was on breaking off the branches of Catholicism by any and all means, while the root system was largely untouched. Indeed, it is my belief that the diversion of spiritual and physical energy was so effectively carried out by the devil that he was able to transfer a good portion of the semi-Pelagian root of Catholicism into the virgin soil of the new “Reformed” movement. Consider Ulrich Zwingli (1484-1531), forebear of modern Reformed theology. Zwingli was busy reforming the church in Switzerland at about the same time that Luther was at work in Germany. But from the very beginning, Zwingli was concerned more with political reform and with an unconditional dismantling and destroying of Roman worship, ornaments and customs (He even abolished the use of organs and bells!)—with Zwingli it was all “baubles” and branches!

Pelagian “Shoots” It was especially difficult for Ulrich Zwingli to see the root cause of Roman error or to be concerned with the vital Scripture doctrines involved, because his background was in humanism and classical studies—he had not experienced the spiritual struggles of Luther, who was pressed almost to despair by the deep conviction of sin and its condemnation. The doctrine of justification by grace alone through faith alone was never the central “life or death” issue of Zwingli’s reformatory concerns as it was for Luther. Therefore we should not be surprised to find the originator of the “Reformed” movement retaining the Roman Catholic semi-Pelagian emphasis regarding the “diseased” but not thoroughly corrupt and dead human will. Krauth says it well:

It is not for their intrinsic value, but for historical reasons, that it is important to follow him in his views. He certainly did not hold, thoroughly and consistently, the doctrine which is couched in the language of our Confession, that “original sin is truly sin.” His fallacy is the ordinary one, that the character of sin is in the deed, not in the essence of moral nature, which originates the deed; that sin cannot be, but must always be done. In other words, he makes a real, not a merely phenomenal difference between sin in us, and sin by us; the sin we have, and the sin we do. Every such distinction is Pelagian.⁷

Zwingli wrote in his book on baptism: “There is nothing in the children of believers, even before baptism, which can properly be called sin.”⁸ Yet he insisted on baptizing infants! This self-contradictory position led to the departure of many of his followers and the formation of the Anabaptist sect which denied in unmistakable terms both the doctrine of original sin and infant baptism. John Calvin later succeeded in suppressing the Pelagian views of Zwingli and the Anabaptists by his forceful assertion of a “double” predestination and the total depravity of man. But in the reaction of Jacob Arminius (d. 1609) to Calvin’s denial of universal grace and the subsequent Arminian emphasis on “Free-Will” so prevalent in the Reformed churches of our day, we see the shoots of the Pelagian roots which Zwingli and other early opponents of Luther did not entirely escape.

IV.

Subtle Anthropocentric Emphasis Among The Reformed

Arminianism is the most glaring anthropocentric emphasis in many churches of the Reformed camp. There are others, particularly in the Calvinistic churches, which are not so obvious. It is these we wish to point out briefly as we conclude this study.

The Determinate Will of God Zwingli indeed denied the “freedom of the will,” emphasized by the Arminians later. Even before Calvin, Zwingli spoke of “Divine Determinism”—the knowledge of God’s determinate will precedes the knowledge of Christ. Thus God’s grace is understood in the sense that God is the “Prime Mover,” NOT as revealed in and through the person and work of Jesus Christ. The will of God is presented as an omnipotent and irresistible force, neither loving, nor good and gracious through the revelation of Christ.

An emphasis on the determinate will of God, rather than the gracious will of God, was and is the basis of the doctrine of “double predestination” as held by the Calvinistic Reformed. But this wrong emphasis, which has the appearance of being theocentric as opposed to the Arminian emphasis on the freedom of the will, arose from a humanistic and rationalistic approach to the question: “Why are not all saved?” That question is never asked by God’s Word; it arises from the mind of man. And, in attempting to find the answer by divorcing the grace of God from His will, Calvin emphasized the discerning powers of human reason over faith’s acceptance of God’s Word. Had the emphasis concerning God’s will been wholly theocentric, the words of Paul to the Ephesians (chapter 1) would have been sufficient. For there

the “will of God” is clearly presented as a good and gracious will in and through Jesus Christ. Divine sovereignty and power do not receive the emphasis in Lutheran theology, rather God’s gracious and loving will in Christ as revealed in His Gospel Word.

The Determinate Will and the Law If, according to the emphasis placed upon the determinate will of God, the Reformed pass by the grace of that will, then what is it that defines and carries out the will of God? It is the LAW above all! It is the divine Law which controls all life and every operation in the world. Ask a pure Calvinist what life is all about and he will probably answer: “Life is obedience to the commandments of God.” So, although the Determinate Will outside of man “robs” man of the freedom of the will, it provides the Reformed with the “inspiration” to think of themselves as the instruments of God—His “Moral Agents” in the world. Hereby the strictness and sternness of the Calvinistic Puritans of the past. Historically, the Reformed have been consistently zealous in the attempt to bring governments and societies in line with the commandments of God and Christian ethics. Witness the present day political maneuverings of the “Moral Majority.”

Given the above Reformed emphasis on divine Law, one should not be surprised if, among some, more emphasis is placed upon doing what is acceptable before God than on gaining acceptance through the merits of Christ alone; on proclaiming God’s Law to the nations than on proclaiming the grace of God in Christ. Perhaps the comment of Reinhold Seeberg is still to the point:

The God of Calvin is the omnipotent Will, ruling throughout the world; the God of Luther is the omnipotent energy of Love manifest in Christ. In the one case, we have acts of compulsion even in the heart, subjections, law, service; in the other, inward conquest by the power of love, free self-surrender, filial love without compulsion. The one does not necessarily exclude the other, but the tone and emphasis give rise to the differences which undeniably exist. From the practical energy of the Reformed ideals—with which praxis has not always been able to keep pace—the Lutheran Church may learn a valuable lesson. But when, in any age of evangelical Christianity, faith grows dim, and love grows cold, and it seems as though the gospel were no longer sufficient to satisfy the advanced spirit of the “modern” world, then will deliverance be found, not in the views of Calvin, but in return to the gospel and the faith of Luther. Evangelical Christianity has yet much to learn from her Luther.⁹

The Law as a Means of Grace Perhaps it was Zwingli’s emphasis on the use of Law by the Sovereign Will which led to his emphasis on the “positive” character of the Law. While Luther emphasized the negative or condemnatory function of the Law also for the Christian, Zwingli spoke of the words and example of Christ taking the place of the Old Testament Law as an outward rule of conduct. In the sense that all who are born of Christ obey His Word, the Law remains and may even be considered a part of the Gospel, according to Zwingli: “The gospel thus understood, namely as the will of God revealed to men and required of them, contains in itself . . . commandment, prohibition, precept, and obedience; so that all commandment and prohibition of God must remain in force forever.”¹⁰ Here we may see that the “gospel” is defined in a manner which emphasizes the commandments of Christ and His exemplary deeds —His speaking and doing to “SHOW” us, but ignores what was done TO HIM in order to SAVE us! Thus the Gospel of Christ was perceived as a “new Law” with its “commandments,” “prohibitions,” and “obedience” early in the history of Reformed theology.

Later John Calvin took up this emphasis on the positive character of the Law, setting forth the so-called “Third Use” as the principal function of the Law for the Christian: “The Third and principal use, finds its place among believers in whose hearts the Spirit of God already lives and reigns.”¹¹ Luther emphasized, on the basis of Galatians 3:19 and other passages, that the chief function of the Law is to convict the heart of sin (the *usus elenchticus* , or *theologicus*). This is its proper function first in the

unbeliever, but also in the Christian because of his Old Adam. Calvin believed that the real function of the Law is fulfilled in believers only, informing them and helping in the performance of the commandments. The words of Exodus 20:2-17 “form us and prepare us for every good work,” according to Calvin.¹²

Like Zwingli, Calvin emphasized the sovereignty of God (the determinate will) over the grace of God and, therefore, also the Law over the Gospel. He believed that it is possible for the Christian to live in the Law without the Law’s condemnation. Thereby he not only removed the “teeth” of the Law as regards the Christian, he relegated the Gospel to the service of the Law. For, if the Law interpreted by Christ and performed by the Christian led by the Spirit may be the ultimate basis for his right standing before God, then the Gospel of Christ’s doing, dying, and resurrection FOR mankind does not provide THE new and only way of salvation, but only the means and preparation for the Christian’s fulfillment of the Law.

The Gospel Legalized Now, if by the unscriptural and high-minded emphasis on the sovereign will of God, which has determined both the over-all thrust and the details of Calvinistic Reformed theology, the Law has assumed Gospel characteristics, we should not be surprised to find that the reverse is also true: the Gospel has taken on legal characteristics among the Reformed. Christ is spoken of as a “Lawgiver.” His kingdom is not appreciated so much as a kingdom of grace, but as a kingdom where He is “the Lord of the Christian’s life”—the One who gives out commands to be obeyed by His subjects. Perhaps this is the unspoken or unwitting basis for the emphasis we so often hear from the many radio pulpits of the Reformed: “Have you received Jesus as your LORD and Savior?” The legalization of the Gospel is further evidenced by the preaching of the Gospel as a mere “declaration of God’s plan of salvation,” a “declaration of duty on the part of the sinner to repent and believe,” a “declaration of the motives which ought to influence the sinner’s mind, such as fear or hope, remorse or gratitude,” and a “promise of acceptance in the case of all those who comply with the conditions.”¹³ (Emphasis added.)

Faith: But when the Gospel of Christ is presented as if it were a mere extension of the Law of
Obedience the Sovereign God, offering grace and the forgiveness of sins only “particularly” to
Or Trust? those who “dutifully” comply with the “conditions,” NOT universally, as in 2 Corinthians 5:19, then faith is emphasized as OBEDIENCE rather than simple TRUST. Do we not see the anthropocentric emphasis here? The sinner dare not regard God as gracious toward him until he has obeyed by faith! The Calvinist’s argument that this faith is still the work of God alone, no “free will” participating, does not cancel the fact that the poor sinner is admonished to check out the obedience of his faith—its repentance and activity—in order to determine his safety before God. But when the Lutheran Confessions speak of the salutary nature of faith, they do not emphasize its inward pointing as obedience, but its outward pointing—a trusting which clings to the cross of Christ and finds its peace in the grace of God toward sinners.

It is the certainty or the certain trust in the heart, when with my whole heart, I regard the promises of God as certain and true, through which there are offered me, without my merit, the forgiveness of sins, grace and salvation, through Christ the Mediator. . . . It is to wish and to receive the offered promise of the remission of sins and of justification. Faith is that my whole heart takes to itself this treasure. It is not my doing, not my presenting or giving, not my work or preparation, but that a heart comforts itself, and is perfectly confident with respect to this, namely, that God makes a present and gift to us, and not we to Him, that He sheds upon us every treasure of grace in Christ.¹⁴

The Gospel Legalized In the Sacraments When the Lutheran Christian is troubled concerning his eternal salvation because he has already considered the weakness of his faith, both as to its numerous doubtings and its poor fruit, he is not told to ponder his faith but the grace of the

cross as it is constantly and freely offered to all by means of the Gospel in the Word and in the Sacraments. But sadly, the Reformed, who have already legalized the Gospel in the Word, do the same with the Sacraments.

Remember, the emphasis has already been placed on the ACTIVITY of faith (obedience) rather than on its RECEPTIVITY (trust). Consequently, those who deny infant baptism do so, not only because they reject the gracious and powerful operation of God by means of simple water connected with the Gospel Word, nor only because they deny original sin, but also because the infant cannot make his own confession—cannot DO for Christ.

Some years ago we asked Pastor C. R. Cawyer of the Church of Christ in Lamar, Colorado, why he bothered to celebrate the Lord's Supper if the believing communicant does not receive the forgiveness of sins thereby. His answer: "Because of the Lord's commandment, 'This do!'" The emphasis for the Reformed communicant is on "This DO!" rather than "This IS . . ."—the activity of faith's obedience, rather than the reception of grace and forgiveness.

The Sacraments of Baptism and Lord's Supper are called "ordinances" to be obeyed because Christ has commanded them for His Church. They become, then, more like sacrifices of obedience which the believer offers to God, rather than vessels full of grace which God offers to the believer—shades of Romanism!

What does this emphasis on the Law and obedience to the "determinate will" of God in all its applications convey to the Reformed lay person but more emphasis on his own will and devotion? Surely, while the Reformed will mightily defend the authority and inspiration of God's Word, their theology and practice represent in varying degrees an insidious returning and "in-turning" of man to himself as he seeks salvation.

**Authority:
The Word of God,
Or Human Reason?** Finally, what about the authority of God's Word among the Reformed? On the surface, with all the emphasis placed upon the sovereignty of God, the will of God, and the "obedience" of faith, one would think that the Reformed would be the first to accept God's every word without question, saying: "Yes, Lord, for so You have spoken." But such is not the case.

John Calvin set off in the wrong direction when he asked why all are not saved and then proceeded to what seemed to him a rational answer: Since God alone is Ruler of all creation, nothing happens without His willing it to be so. Therefore that all are not finally saved must be traced to His unwillingness to do so. Hence, there was in eternity a divine election unto damnation. So far John Calvin. Accordingly, we have seen God's Word in Ezekiel 33:11, 1 Timothy 2, John 3:16, Matthew 23:37, and many other passages proclaiming the universal love of God and the seriousness and efficacy of His grace, subjected to the rationalizing spirit of the Calvinists.

This same setting of the human understanding over the Word of God rather than within the Word is the wrong emphasis which cannot understand, and therefore will not accept, the words of Scripture which say that the baptismal waters create saving faith and wash away sin (Acts 22:16, Eph. 5:26, Tit. 3:5). When Zwingli argued with Luther that water cannot do such great things, he received the following answer, demonstrating where the emphasis lay for Lutherans:

If God bade you pick up a stalk of grain or strip a feather, and with His command promised that through this act you should have forgiveness of all yours sins, grace, and ever lasting life, should you not accept that proposal with great pleasure and gratitude, love it, praise it, and esteem that stalk or feather a higher and holier possession than heaven and earth?

It was, of course, during the “Sacramentarian Controversy” of the 1520s that a vital distinction became apparent between the two main protestant bodies of the Reformation. The rational spirit of Zwingli combined with his extremism to deny the bodily presence of Christ in the Sacrament. He reasoned that, since Christ was true Man, like the rest of us, His body could not be physically present and taking up space in more than one place at a time—Christ could not be both “on the right hand of God the Father” and in the Sacrament. Zwingli, therefore, arrogated to himself the right to interpret the *est* of the words of institution, “This is . . . ,” as “signifies” or “symbolizes.” Bucer and Calvin were somewhat less bold. They wrote of a “real,” though not physical presence of Christ, because they were intent on bringing the Zwinglians and the Lutherans together on this issue.

But Luther held to the simple word of Christ and would have no fellowship with that “other spirit” demonstrated by the Reformed:

I rate as one concoction, namely as Sacramentarians and fanatics, which they also are, all who will not believe that the Lord’s bread in the Supper is His true natural body,. . . he who will not believe this (I say) should let me alone, and hope for no fellowship with me; this is not going to be altered.¹⁵

In his *Large Catechism* Luther emphasizes the authority and power of the Word of Christ:

Let a hundred thousand devils, with all the fanatics, rush forward and say, “How can bread and wine be Christ’s body and blood?” Still I know that all the spirits and scholars put together have less wisdom than the divine Majesty has in his little finger. Here we have Christ’s word, “Take, eat; this is my body.” “Drink of it, all of you, this is the new covenant in my blood,” etc. Here we shall take our stand and see who dares to instruct Christ and alter what he has spoken.¹⁶

Fifty years later the Formula of Concord succeeded in finally uniting the Lutheran Church on the proper emphasis, removing the leaven of Calvinism. It spoke of the humble faith of Abraham who believed the Word of God concerning the promised Seed which was to come from him although this seemed impossible to his reason. Then follows:

Thus we, too, are simply to believe with all humility and obedience the plain, firm, clear, and solemn words and command of our Creator and Redeemer, without any doubt and disputation as to how it agrees with our reason or is possible. For these words were spoken by that Lord who is infinite Wisdom and Truth itself, and also can execute and accomplish everything which He promises.¹⁷

When the Reformed argue to this day that Christ “can’t be everywhere also according to His human and physical being”; “Christ can’t do anything more with His body than we can with ours; therefore, He could not really pass through closed doors or really disappear” (contra John 20:19 and Luke 24:31); “Christ could not really have given His body and blood to eat and drink as He sat at supper with His first disciples, much less now—He can’t have a body of limitless substance”; and so on, they do indeed place too much emphasis upon man, who is nothing, and think too little of Christ, Who is everything. They elevate the authority of human reason above the authority of Christ and His Word.

Such an approach to Scripture is really a reproach of God’s Word wherever it does not square with human reason. Anselm of Canterbury has been quoted somewhere as saying: “I do not understand in order to believe, but I believe in order to understand.” In the context of one’s approach to the divinely revealed and often paradoxical Word of our Savior God, any other emphasis exalts the powers of corrupted human reason above the Word of God.

In Conclusion This is the place to conclude our essay. But isn’t this where we started? Satan

... ?” By her answer Eve had already begun to question the authority and the truth of God’s Word. Therefore also His gracious will came into question—she “legalized” the gracious per mission of God. Having questioned the truth of God’s Word and His gracious ways, Eve was prepared to accept The Lie, or any adulteration of God’s Word that should come forth from the Deceiver. Satan let her have it! Believing now that she could become God’s equal by the exercise of her own free will, she took the forbidden fruit and died.

One does not need an electron microscope to see here the deadly germs of anthropocentric theology. The emphasis on the power of human reason, the legalizing of God’s gracious Word, the application of the human will to gain equality or acceptance with God—all are present also among the Reformed in varying degrees.

The Reformed believe that we Lutherans ought to have learned a lesson from them in their 16th century reformation at tempts. But let’s see how this is so. When Martin Luther set forth the authority of SCRIPTURE ALONE, arguing that the Pope and his councils err, it was not to destroy “Romanism,” but to establish the other two principles of the Reformation, namely, that the sinner is saved by GRACE ALONE through FAITH ALONE. The spirit of the Reformed, on the other hand, emphasized a radical break with the established church— Luther had “not gone far enough.”

But in seeking to go further than Luther from bondage to papal authority, the Reformed also drifted beyond Luther’s anchor in the Scripture to establish human reason as the ultimate authority in matters of doctrine. They drifted so far that, in reality, they were not so far from the Roman See. For, if one is not bound by Scripture alone, then he is bound by human reason and human will—whether the Pope’s, Luther’s, Zwingli’s, or Calvin’s, it makes no difference! Such human authority prevailing, the Gospel of salvation by GRACE ALONE through FAITH ALONE will not long endure inviolate, for the corrupt human nature knows nothing and cares nothing for the God of grace. He must reveal Himself in and by His Word or else He can not be known to poor sinners. Truly, if we have anything to learn from the Reformed, it must be this: forsaking all that is in us or of us, we must at all times cling to all that God is and has become for us as revealed in His Word alone. Lord God, help us, for it is plain we cannot help ourselves!

God’s Word is our great heritage
And shall be ours forever;
To spread its light from age to age
Shall be our chief endeavor.
Through life it guides our way,
In death it is our stay.
Lord, grant, while worlds endure,
We keep its teachings pure

Throughout all generations. Amen. (TLH 283)

Notes

¹ Adolf Köberle, *The Quest for Holiness* (Harper and Brothers, 1936; Augsburg Publishing House, 1938; St. Louis: Concordia, 1982) 18.

² Köberle 2.

³ Köberle 4.

⁴ Köberle 18.

⁵ C. P. Krauth, *The Conservative Reformation and Its Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963)

446. Krauth quotes from Augustine's assessment of the teachings of Pelagius.

⁶ Martin Luther, *The Bondage of the Will* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1931) 391-392. German reference: St. Louis Ed., 18:1996.

⁷ Krauth 449. It should be mentioned here that there is some confusion among scholars and historians as to whether Zwingli held Pelagian views or not. Reinhold Seeberg, in his *Text-Book of the History of Doctrines*, offers many quotations from Zwingli's writings which clearly deny the gross "free-will" emphasis of Pelagius and even the meritorious capabilities of a renewed will, as per the Romanists. Yet, insofar as Zwingli speaks of original sin as a disease that "does not merit damnation," he was certainly Pelagian.

⁸ Krauth 448.

⁹ Reinhold Seeberg, *Text-Book of the History of Doctrines*, trans. from German, 2 vols. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1966) 2: 416-417.

¹⁰ Seeberg 2: 311.

¹¹ Werner Elert, *Law and Gospel*, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967) 44. This is a translation of an essay in a volume entitled, *Zwischen Gnade und Ungnade: Abwandlungen des Themas Gesetz und Evangelium*, Munich 1948. Elert quotes from Calvin's *Institutes*, Bk. II, chap. VII, sect. 12.

¹² Elert 7. Quoted from Calvin's *Institutes*, Bk. II, chap. VII, sect. 13, as published in *Library of Christian Classics*, vols. 20 and 21 (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960).

¹³ F. Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics*, 4 vols. (St. Louis: Concordia, 1921) 3: 248. Pieper quotes Alexander Hodge, *Outlines*, 333.

¹⁴ *Concordia Triglotta*, Augsburg Confession—Apology, Art. IV, "What is Justifying Faith" (St. Louis: Concordia, 1921) 135:48,49.

¹⁵ *Concordia Triglotta*, Formula of Concord—Thorough Declaration, Art. VII, "Of the Holy Supper" 983:33. These words were spoken by Luther as part of his last confession before his death.

¹⁶ *Luther's Large Catechism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959) 921.

¹⁷ *Concordia Triglotta* 989:47.
