

JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

VOLUME 34      SEPTEMBER 1994      NUMBER 3

CONTENTS

A PRE-REFORMATION MEDITATION	Robert Mackensen
CHRISTIAN WORSHIP - A LUTHERAN HYMNAL (WELS)	Paul Schaller
EXEGESIS: GALATIANS (Conclusion) (Trans. C. M. Gullerud)	Dr. Joh. Ylvisaker
BOOK REVIEWS:	
<i>Catholic, Lutheran, Protestant: A Doctrinal Comparison of Three Christian Confessions</i> (Reviewer: Stephen Kurtzahn)	by Gregory L. Jackson
<i>Pastors (Off the Record)</i>	by Stefan Ulstein
<i>Exit Interviews</i>	by William D. Hendricks
<i>Handbook of Evangelical Theologians,</i> (Reviewer: David Lau)	ed. by Walter A. Elwell

---

**A Pre-Reformation Meditation**

*Robert Mackensen*

*“Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth” 2 Timothy 2:15.*

The directions of a good recipe should be followed exactly. One successful baker carefully weighed and measured the ingredients for his bread dough every morning, even though he had prepared that same recipe hundreds of times over the years. The Lord Jesus has provided Christians with the only successful recipe for changing slaves of Satan into children of God. It is found in Luke, chapter 24: “Repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations.” Simon Peter carefully followed that recipe in his sermon on Pentecost Sunday. First he preached God’s sharp law, which makes people realize their sinfulness. He said, “God hath made that same Jesus, Whom ye crucified, both Lord and Christ.” When they sorrowfully cried, “What shall we do?”, he proclaimed God’s comforting gospel, which enables people to enjoy God’s mercy, saying, “Be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins” (Acts 2). About 3,000 people became Christians that day and they continued steadfastly in the apostle’s doctrine, fellowship, breaking of bread, and in prayers. The recipe worked!

We Christians today dare not tamper with God’s successful law-gospel formula. Therefore through these words in 2 Timothy, the Holy Spirit calls out:

**CHRISTIANS! RIGHTLY DIVIDE GOD’S WORD OF TRUTH**

- I. All of us are to rightly divide God’s Word of Truth.
- II. Doing so requires much effort.
- III. But it results in great blessings.

## I

“Study to show thyself approved unto God.” The apostle Paul wrote this admonition to the young minister, Timothy, who was serving the Christian congregation in Ephesus of Asia Minor. Timothy, like all Christian pastors and teachers, was to distribute correctly the Bible teachings to his congregation. But since pastors and teachers are helpers of Christian parents, God also admonished Christian parents, especially the fathers, to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord (Eph. 6). Luther’s Small Catechism says at least six times that “The head of the family should teach the various parts of Christian doctrine, in all simplicity, to his household.” This is accomplished by rightly dividing the Word of Truth.

Since Scripture further teaches in 2 Corinthians 5 that “we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ” and in Romans 14 that “everyone of us shall give account of himself to God,” therefore, every individual Christian|you, you, you, and l|every individual is responsible for correctly dividing God’s Word of Truth in his or her own life.

## II

Doing so requires much effort. That is why the Apostle Paul urged, “Study ... to rightly divide the Word of Truth.” The Greek word here translated “study” means “earnestly strive, struggle” as in “endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace” (Eph. 4). The word contains a sense of urgency: the shepherds “came with haste” to Bethlehem to see the infant Christ (Luke 2), and Jesus told Zacchaeus to “make haste” to come down from the sycamore tree (Luke 19). Timothy was to work hard in presenting the Bible teachings at the proper time to his church members. In the same way today, Christian pastors, teachers, parents, and individuals must strive diligently and A.S.A.P. to use correctly all the Bible teachings.

The Bible contains many doctrines, such as the Ten Commandments, Creed, Lord’s Prayer, Baptism, Keys and Lord’s Supper. But each doctrine falls into either the law or gospel category. Any Bible teaching which demands, crushes, frightens, or condemns us human beings belongs to the law group. Any Bible teaching which rescues, comforts, and forgives us humans beings belongs in the gospel (good-spell, good news) group. God’s law statements tell us human beings what we are required to do and not do (Exod. 20): “Thou shalt honor thy father and thy mother ... Thou shalt not kill.” God’s gospel statements tell us what God has done and still does for our salvation (John 3): “God so loved the world . . . He gave His only begotten Son.” His law shows us our sin and the wrath of God (Rom. 3 & 6): “By the law is the knowledge of sin ... The wages of sin is death.” His gospel shows us our Savior and the grace of God (John 1): “Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.” The law demands righteousness (Matt. 5): “Be ye therefore perfect.” The gospel gives righteousness (Rom. 10): “Christ is the fulfillment of the law for righteousness.” The law provides no strength for a godly life (Rom. 5 & 7): “The law works wrath ... and kills.” The gospel enables us to run the way of God’s commandments (Ps. 119:32): “I will run the way of Thy commandments when [after] Thou shalt enlarge [comfort] my heart.”

Therefore, O Christian, strive to correctly identify Bible statements as being either law or gospel. Exercise your ability to do so with the following passages: “The wages of sin is death,” “The gift of God is eternal life,” “The Lord is my Shepherd,” “God so loved the world,” “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God,” “Thou shalt not steal,” “Today shalt thou be with me in paradise,” “Cursed is everyone that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them,” “Be of good cheer, thy sins be forgiven thee.”

Easy enough? That’s only the beginning of rightly dividing the Word of Truth. A much more difficult requirement is to keep law and gospel separate from each other. Mixing the two destroys their proper function, like pouring pickle juice over ice cream. Keep the salty brine of God’s law away from the sweet cream of His gospel. Some ways of mixing law and gospel which you will want to avoid are: do not apply crushing law to a contrite, humble sinner. Do not apply comforting gospel to a willful, stubborn sinner. Do not say, “God likes me because I am sorry for my sins.” Contrition did not pay for your sins. Jesus did. He is the only reason God likes you. Guard against making faith your Savior. Faith did not die on the cross as your sacrifice Lamb. Christ did. Be a Christian, not a faithian. Be careful not to picture a Christian as a person who never sins. Out of weakness and ignorance, we Christians daily sin much. On the other hand, never picture a Christian as one who stubbornly insists on sinning. Do not talk as if God approves of any sin, no matter how small; for example, “Do not tell lies, except for the little white ones.” Never talk as if Christ has not paid for all sins, no matter how great; for example, “Jesus died for everyone except Hitler and Stalin.” Be careful not to make improved behavior, membership in an orthodox congregation, or years of service in the church the reason why you and I will surely go to heaven. Jesus alone is our Way to heaven. No one comes to God the Father but by Him who poured out His life-blood in full payment for every one of our sins.

God’s law and gospel were harmfully mixed in 1955, when the Wisconsin Synod, after many years of admonition, correctly used God’s sharp law and identified the Missouri Synod as a false teaching church body. But then, even though

Jesus, in Matthew 7, clearly taught, “Beware of [watch out for, have no fellowship with, stay away from] false prophets,” the Wisconsin Synod continued having religious fellowship with Missouri for six more years. Dealing with dangerous, false teachers as if they are harmless, weak brothers is applying comforting gospel to willful, stubborn sinners. Our CLC would not continue harping on this matter, were it not for the fact that, to this day, the Wisconsin Synod refuses to acknowledge that this, a mixing of law and gospel, was incorrect.

O Christian, learn from this tragedy to work very hard| not only to place all the condemning teachings of Scripture into the law container and all the comforting teachings of Scripture into the gospel container, but to keep them separate. Doing so will help you, while struggling to accomplish the most difficult part of correctly dividing God’s Word; namely, to decide whether to apply the law or the gospel in a given situation—whether to scold or compliment, punish or console, apply the rod or give the apple. Martin Luther said, “Whoever can correctly apply the law and gospel should go to the head of the class and be recognized as a doctor of theology.”

Apply God’s caustic law, without a single drop of comforting gospel to willful, defiant, impenitent wrong-doers, but apply God’s message of full forgiveness, without a single syllable of condemnation or condition to humble, cooperative, repentant sinners. The Prophet Nathan correctly applied severe law to unrepentant King David, saying, “Thou art the guilty one. You committed adultery with Bathsheba and had her husband murdered.” But after David sorrowfully repented (read his Psalm 51), Nathan applied comforting gospel, saying, “The Lord hath put away thy sin.” Luther wrote, “The law should be revealed with thunderbolts to those who are foolish and stiff-necked, but the gospel should be presented gently to those who are terrified and humbled.” Therefore, O Christian, strive to apply God’s law or His gospel correctly to each situation which arises in your own life or that of others.

### III

Wonderful blessings result when this is done. You will be “approved unto God.” He will say, “Well done, thou good and faithful servant.” You will be “a workman that needeth not be ashamed.” Rebellious slaves of Satan will become obedient children of God.

One of the great blessings of Luther’s reformation was his teaching the proper distinction between God’s law and gospel and their proper application. You will not find this right division of Scripture clearly taught in other church denominations. Highly value your conservative Lutheran synod which still holds fast to this treasure. As members of the Church of the Lutheran Confession, read and study those confessions. Article five of the Formula of Concord offers a clear presentation of this law and gospel subject.

Unless you can correctly distinguish law from gospel, God’s Bible remains a jumble of seeming contradictions: He preserves the world; He destroys the world. He loves sinners; He is angry with them. He punishes sin; He forgives sin. But rightly divide law and gospel and your Bible becomes a reliable guide for Christian living. For example: when you are tempted to commit adultery, apply God’s law by saying, “How can I do this great wickedness and sin against God who has commanded, ‘Thou shalt not commit adultery’?” But when your soul is cast down and grieves for even wanting to disobey God, then apply the gospel. Hurry to Calvary’s cross, where the shedding of Christ’s life-blood paid for all people’s sins, including all of yours and mine.

How precious is your Bible, this Book divine—by inspiration given! Bright as a lamp its doctrines shine to guide our souls to heaven. Its law shows to man his wandering ways and where his feet have trod. Its gospel brings the matchless grace of a forgiving God.

---

## Christian Worship—A Lutheran Hymnal (WELS)

### II

#### THE LITURGY OF *CHRISTIAN WORSHIP*

*Paul Schaller*

The emancipation which the religion of Christ has brought to the spiritual life of man embraces the freedom from fixed forms of worship. The ceremonial statutes in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, which were laid down for the Church of the Old Covenant, have no counterpart in the New Testament. The Church of the New Dispensation has no divinely prescribed liturgy and agenda. Still, the New Testament abounds in admonitions to the followers of Christ to engage in private and public, individual and joint worship of God. “The true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship Him” (John 4:23), -- this saying of Christ is the only regulation which

the Author and Finisher of the faith that saves men has considered it necessary to apply to human acts of worship offered to the true God. This regulation is comprehensive, but it relates to the inward motive and quality of the worshiper rather than to the external expression and features of his worship. Christ has taught men that God esteems the doer more than the deed, the devout heart more than an act of homage, which even a hypocrite may offer, whose heart is far from the Lord, and whose worship, accordingly, is vain and valueless. When men draw near to God with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having their hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and their bodies washed with pure water (Heb. 10:19-25), He condescends to join them in their public assemblies, and hallows by His presence every form of worship which the character of the day and season suggests to their faith. His presence is conditioned on one thing only, *viz.*, that they meet “in His name” (Matt. 18:20).

Evangelical freedom from the old ceremonialism does not mean license and extreme individualism. There may be, especially in the joint public worship of Christians, things that are unbecoming (see 1 Cor. 11:14; Col. 2:16ff.). The apostolic warning: “Let all things be done decently and in order” (1 Cor. 14:40), was uttered with reference to forms of public worship. In a similar connection the same apostle has declared: “All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient; all things are lawful for me, but all things edify not” (1 Cor. 10:23), and has urged the members of the Church to “follow after things wherewith one may edify another” (Rom. 14:19).

The public worship of a number of Christians, by its very nature as a joint operation, requires ordering, to prevent confusion and collision. Moreover, whatever forms are adopted to express the homage of a company of believers, they must center around the communal interests of Christians. In the worship of the congregation the *vox ecclesiae* is to be heard, responding to, and re-echoing, the *vox Dei* in the Scriptures. Accordingly, the grand central truths of the Christian faith must find sole recognition and expression in a Christian formulary of worship. While the individual worshiper comes, indeed, to feed his own soul at the common banquet spread for all, and satisfies the special needs of his inner life from the stores of divine grace provided for all; while the individual believer in his heart undoubtedly connects with the common prayers, praises, petitions, and thanksgivings of all believers particular meanings which the words have assumed to him because of the peculiar way in which his Christian course is being shaped for him, still there is in the liturgical formularies of the Church little, if any, room for the expression of private spiritual experiences. For these, other provisions must be made. The liturgy of the Church and the official sacred acts of her ministers must be characterized by objectiveness. The entire liturgy is really a confession on the part of the whole Church, and its forms must be in harmony with the common faith and the common life of faith of all its members, so that any Christian who chances to come into an assembly of worshipers can at once intelligently and sympathetically enter into the religious exercise, and any non-Christian who witnesses an act of Christian worship is at once informed regarding the essential, basic, central facts of the religion of Christ.

The oldest Christian liturgies are stamped with this quality of objectiveness, and are thus clear echoes of the Word of God with its universal message to the children of men. Within these formularies for molding the worship of the believers there has been ample room given to the fervor of every sentiment which the heart may seek to express in worship. The admiration and the fear of the believer, his sorrow and his joy, are all attuned to great facts and themes of the divine revelation, and are ringing with the sonorous keynote of redeeming mercy.

The early Christian spirit of worship has reappeared in the liturgies of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. There is a stately dignity, a heavenly grandeur, in these forms of worship which awes, while it inspires and elevates, the worshiper. Also by her liturgies and agendas the Lutheran Church had offered to the world the evidence of her apostolic and ecumenical character.

The preceding paragraphs are quoted from the Foreword to the first English liturgy published by the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, July 28, 1916. The reason advanced for publishing an English liturgy was “to have a common ritual for all sacred acts of congregations and their ministers.”

This was also one of the hoped-for advantages of the Synodical Conference’s *The Lutheran Hymnal* of 1941, namely that in our modern mobile society, people traveling from one congregation to another within the fellowship would be able to follow the same path of worship with which they were familiar at home.

But it did not take twenty years for congregations to insert their favorite customs, opening altar prayers, offering hymns, closing stanzas, etc. Already before 1960 one could visit congregations within a Lutheran fellowship and find some substituting a hymn stanza (commonly, *All Glory Be To God on High*, stanza 1) for the *Gloria in Excelsis* printed out in the forepart of *The Lutheran Hymnal* (p. 7ff.). Some congregations even printed out the above-mentioned stanza and pasted it in all their hymnals, making it a permanent revision. This particular change in the liturgy, however,

eliminates the reference to the third person of the Trinity (cum Sancto Spirito), which had been a part of the Gloria for centuries.

Other congregations might have been found to omit the post-communion liturgy altogether (The Nunc Dimittis, The Thanksgiving, The Salutation, and the Benedicamus), and to go from the distribution directly to the Benediction, thus leaving out whole portions of Scripture. As a guest organist at various Lutheran congregations in the 1960's, the present writer soon learned that it did not suffice for the pastor to inform the organist: "we follow the page 5 liturgy." Following such a statement, one was still obliged to peruse the liturgy page by page with the pastor to discover where the congregation had made its changes.

Now, this is not to say that these congregations did not have good reasons for rewriting, as it were, the common liturgy of *The Lutheran Hymnal*. Just the opposite. Each congregation was free to use, not use, or adapt the order according to its customs and desires. As far as this writer knows, the orthodoxy of none of these congregations was questioned because of their changes in liturgy. These examples are mentioned only to balance any inclination we might have to jump too heavily on, read too much into, or see threatening specters in every attempt to modify or "up-date" liturgical forms.

Especially when the "new" liturgy comes from outside the fellowship, one does tend to look more closely at proposed changes in worship forms. If the form comes from a group which can, by unanimous vote, recognize a situation as one described in Scripture, and then later declare, "No, we didn't really see it. It was not conclusive," might we not then be tempted to look for other kinds of "trial balloons" in future publications of that group?

But if we harbor the fear that examining or changing our liturgy will automatically make us "liberal," or if we harbor the hope that keeping our liturgy the same will insure our staying conservative, then we should consider how difficult it would be to find a church that first erred in its liturgy. By the time the error surfaces in the liturgy, the chances are pretty good that it has already taken root and grown elsewhere.

Let us, then, take a short walk through the five regular orders of worship presented in *Christian Worship*, and as we look at them, we will want to do so carefully, but honestly. After all, we have our Savior's assurance, "If you continue in my Word, you will know the truth . . ."

## **Prayers -**

On page four of *The Lutheran Hymnal*, some short prayers and general rubrics are listed. *Christian Worship* has dropped the rubrics, but expanded the personal prayers to two pages. These now include not only prayers before and after worship, and before and after communion, but also for peace, for remembrance of baptism, for personal confession of sin, for personal praise and thanksgiving, and by those serving at worship. We note that one of the prayers for before worship is a modern language version of the opening altar prayer from the Lutheran Hymnary.

Six more pages of personal prayers are added on pp. 134-139. Some of these might serve as collects, or joint petitions in a corporate worship service, but most are written in a personal manner, as the title implies. There is no section of collects.

## **Holy Baptism -**

The first order of service in *Christian Worship* is a form for Baptism, intended to be used after the opening hymn, which is where some of us customarily hold an infant baptism with our present *Agenda*. It is introduced by a Trinitarian salutation based on the apostolic benediction. The minister then quotes Matthew 28:19 and speaks of the need for Baptism because of original sin. The congregation responds with the significance of Baptism in our daily life. Thereupon the congregation joins in the confession of both original and active sin. Following the absolution, the baptism continues at the font. A question and answer form for confessing the faith is provided for adults, while for children the word to the parents includes the words of Jesus: "Let the little children come to me . . ." We are happy to note the omission of the assertion that faith cannot be worked in little children by the spoken Word (telling them of Christ), which would be hard to substantiate from Scripture. The sign of the cross on head and heart is called for and then the application of the water and the Word. The congregation is directed to stand for the exhortation, which includes also parents and sponsors, and then, after a prayer concludes this portion of the service, the regular service is continued at the point following the confession of sins.

Note: Emergency Baptism is treated at the close of the Baptism service, bottom of page 14.

## **The Common Service -**

In *The Lutheran Hymnal* the Order of Morning Service without communion (p. 5) is almost identical up to the sermon with the Order of Holy Communion (p. 15). In *Christian Worship* these two orders are combined in “The Common Service” (p. 15), which may be used with or without the sacrament. It opens with a hymn and the Trinitarian invocation. The music of the congregation’s “Amen” is identical with TLH, but a pitch lower.

### **Confession of Sins -**

Following the invitation to confession, seeking forgiveness in Jesus’ name, the congregation responds by speaking a confession together. Omitted are the two versicles (in TLH) with their sung responses: “Our help is in the name of the Lord” and “I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord.” Especially the second versicle brings the powerful assurance of forgiveness as the strongest inducement to confess our sins, but one wonders how often this is thought of when we use the versicle fifty-two or more times a year.

The Kyrie is no longer a prayer for mercy in the trials and vicissitudes of life (as Matt. 20:30-34), but is sung as a confession of sins (as Luke 18:13) just before the absolution is pronounced, as it was, previous to *The Lutheran Hymnal*, in the 1932 *Book of Hymns*.

The form of the confession itself is a combination of the two forms used in TLH (pp. 6 & 16). It confesses both original and active sin, as on page 6, but in the personal form which precedes communion, as on page 16. *Christian Worship* uses the same words for confession in Baptism (p.14), the Common Service (p.15), and the Service of the Word and Sacrament (p.26). The only variation comes in the Service of the Word (p.38); it is the individual “I am altogether sinful from birth,” and not the corporate “We are by nature sinful and unclean . . .” It does not fall into the trap, however, of getting too specific, so that some might feel it doesn’t apply to them, but it can well be used by all in the corporate worship setting.

### **Prayer and Praise -**

After the Confession of Sins, the service then begins with the Gloria in Excelsis. The Kyrie has already been sung as a confession of sins, and the Introit has been moved to a later position and replaced. The Gloria (p. 16) uses music with which users of *The Lutheran Hymnal* would be familiar, though it is once again pitched a step lower. The other notable change is the absence of the King James *thee’s* and *thou’s*. We are quite used to the familiar form of the second person pronoun from most modern Bible translations, but its appearance in liturgy obviously awaited a new printing of the same.

The Prayer of the Day, or Collect, as we noted before, is not listed in the hymnal itself, but occupies the same position in the page 16 liturgy as it does in TLH. It is preceded by a salutation and followed by the reading of the Scripture lessons.

The congregation is seated for the first two readings and then stands for the third (gospel) lesson. This is not a new custom, of course, but neither is the red-letter Bible. In general, the sitting and standing is spelled out more in *Christian Worship* and left less to the direction of the officiant. The congregation is also told to sit for the hymns, though some congregations in our circles have been accustomed to sit while praying and stand while singing. Is it so necessary to spell out this kind of uniformity for all?

Following the first lesson (usually Old Testament Lesson of the Three-Year Lectionary) the Psalm of the Day is chanted. This appears to be the replacement for the Introit of *The Lutheran Hymnal* service. The Introit for the fourth Sunday after Easter, e.g., consists of Psalm 98, verses 1a, 2, and 1b, followed by the Gloria Patri. In *Christian Worship*, these few verses have been expanded to five verses of Psalm 67, with a sixth verse serving as a refrain (Series B Lectionary). The Gloria Patri then follows, ending with the refrain of the Psalm once more. If the Introit was once used while the pastor or priest first entered the sanctuary, the Psalm of the Day is here used to bring the congregation from the first to the second Scripture reading.

We note in passing that these Psalms in *Christian Worship* are meant to be chanted, as were the Introits at one time, but that there is no “Book of Psalms” (or other Scripture lessons) for responsive reading by the congregation which enjoys those features of *The Lutheran Hymnal* (and other hymnals). Such readings would have to be printed out in a service folder for the congregation desiring them.

The Gradual, usually one or two selected Psalm verses or the Sentence for the Season (*The Lutheran Hymnal*, p. 10) becomes the “Verse of the Day” in *Christian Worship* (p. 18), and is followed by the congregation singing “Alleluia!” It is noted in *Christian Worship* that the Alleluia may be omitted during Lent, a practice which apparently goes back to the days before Luther, for he once commented on the Gradual: “Nor is it proper to distinguish Lent, Holy Week, or Good Friday from other days, lest we seem to mock and ridicule Christ with half of a mass and the one part of the sacrament. For the Alleluia is the perpetual voice of the church, just as the memorial of His passion and victory is perpetual” (*Luther’s Works*, American Edition, Vol. 53, p. 24).

The Gospel is preceded and followed by the same responses as are found in *The Lutheran Hymnal*, though once again a step lower in pitch.

The Creed follows, either Nicene or Apostles' Creed, in new translations. This writer does not believe that in a worship service, having different translations printed out is as hard on congregations as it would be if they were reciting from memory as was done more in the past. Today one notes many people following along in their books, even if they have known these forms from memory for many years. Getting one more sense (viz., sight) involved can help concentration, and sometimes even "improve hearing."

One notable improvement in the Nicene Creed is the translation "God from God, Light from Light," etc. This seems much clearer to one who did not always understand that section as a child, though the same word (εκ) is still translated "of" in "begotten of the Father," so some of the train of thought still seems a little hazy.

Another improvement is the pronoun "his" in "and his kingdom will have no end." Over the years there have been those who thought that it was the living and the dead whose kingdom would have no end.

The phrase "became fully human" for εναθρωπησαντα seems unfortunate in our day, when so-called scholars sometimes urge "the full humanity of Jesus" in casting doubt upon the Virgin Birth and Deity of Jesus, the very doctrine the Nicene Creed was meant to defend (e.g., *What's Going On Among Lutherans*, NWPH, 1992, p. 91). Apparently the present reading was adopted after feedback from the *Sampler* came in, since there the translation reads, "and was made man. If the translation "was made man" suggested only and to some, perhaps something similar to "human being" would still convey the thought of εναθρωπησαντα. "And was made man" still seems best.

Apparently it seemed unclear that crucifixion was a form of execution, for παθοντα is now translated "suffered death." Is the "swoon theory" so strong in our day? Perhaps it is. But if we said someone was electrocuted, or beheaded, would we have to add that he suffered death? Perhaps we would. The Nicene confessors did not.

In the Apostles' Creed, we notice that "the communion of saints" is presented as a subset of "the holy Christian Church," though it is no longer done with punctuation (commas and semicolon) which was not in the original anyway. The *Sampler* had it on the same line, which seemed clearer to this eye, but perhaps in the final form that would have made the one line extend too far in a list of shorter phrases. Editorial questions.

Following the Hymn and the Sermon, the congregation stands to sing "Create in me a clean heart . . ." The melody is the same as page 22 in *The Lutheran Hymnal*. After the offering, the congregation rises again for the Prayer of the Church. This apparently replaces the General Prayer. Various prayers are suggested in the section entitled "Prayers of the Church" beginning on page 123. This section includes a page of responsive material for each of the seasons or occasions: Advent, Epiphany, Lent, Easter, Sundays after Pentecost, General Thanksgiving, Mission of the Church, The Nation, and Intercession. The Lenten prayer takes the form of a bidding prayer, and all of them have a section for special prayers and intercessions to be inserted and a moment of silent (individual) prayer.

Two forms of the Lord's Prayer are given, one the traditional (Book of Common Prayer) form that our hymnal uses, and the other a newer translation. Then follows the communion, which follows quite closely the form of *The Lutheran Hymnal*, updating some of the language. In the Preface the word "salutary" (beneficial, *heilsam*) is omitted, rather than finding a word more people might understand. In general the proper prefaces seem to have been shortened, which is not a bad idea. The conclusion ("Therefore, with all the saints on earth and hosts of heaven") avoids the question of why the term "arch-angel" does not occur in the plural form in the Bible. I like it.

In the Sanctus, while "Lord God of heavenly hosts" is not updated language and may not convey the idea of "armies," at least it will not be mistaken for Sabbath, as the Hebrew *Sabaoth* sometimes has been. The Pax Domini has been retained after the Words of Institution, and the Agnus Dei is sung before the distribution. Again the music is familiar, as is the Nunc Dimittis, though a pitch lower, and without the Gloria Patri at the conclusion. In Luther's post-communion prayer "salutary gift" becomes "holy supper." The Aaronic benediction concludes the service: "The Lord look on you with favor and + give you peace."

The closing service for the non-communion worship follows. The collects for the Word and the Church are rendered with clarity, and the Aaronic benediction is identical to that above.

## **Service of Word and Sacrament -**

This version of the communion service has the same general order (Confession, Prayer and Praise, The Word, Prayer of the Church, The Sacrament) but with different forms and musical settings.

The confession contains elements of both our page 6 and our page 16 confessions. It personally confesses original sin, as well as sins of thought, word, and action (p. 6), and it acknowledges deserving punishment both now and in eternity (temporal and eternal punishment, p. 16). "Heartily sorry" becomes "truly sorry" and the word "sincerely" does not appear. The simplicity and forthrightness of the confession should suffice to show that the repentance is meant. The

absolution spoken by the pastor is the same as in the first liturgy of *Christian Worship*, and does not mention ordination as a credential for pronouncing forgiveness.

In this service, the Kyrie is once again a plea for mercy in the troubles of this life. The congregation sings the litany three times in response to the minister's prayer for all needs, wisdom, courage to stand firm, an ear for the prayers of the faithful, and the well-being of the Church throughout the world.

Then follows a song of praise based on the Psalm: "O Lord, our Lord, how glorious is your name in all the earth." The Prayer of the Day is followed by the first two Scripture lessons, the congregation seated. The Psalm of the Day again bridges the two lessons, and the Verse of the Day is sung by the choir (or the congregation sings a general verse). Since this begins and ends with a three-fold "Alleluia," its omission is allowed during Lent. The congregation stands for the gospel and responds at the close of it. The Hymn of the Day is followed by the Sermon, and then the Nicene Creed is confessed before the offerings are gathered. The congregation stands for the Prayer of the Church (General Prayer), which is presented in a responsive format. This is surely an easier way to maintain concentration than standing and listening to the minister speak facing the altar for five minutes or so. This prayer also has a place for special intercessions and silent prayer, and then culminates in the joint praying of the Lord's Prayer, again presented in two forms. This, incidentally, may be a good way of demonstrating that a change in wording is not necessarily a desecration of the Lord's Prayer. *The Lutheran Hymnal*, after all, employs a wording different from the King James version of the Bible, the version which was in common use in 1941.

The Sacrament begins with the Preface as in *The Lutheran Hymnal*, page 24, bottom (different music), and then has a sentence of praise in place of "It is truly meet, right, and salutary . . ." Seasonal sentences are suggested, rather than the Proper Prefaces of TLH, page 25. The Seasonal sentence concludes with the statement (resembling Revelation 12:10):

*Now have come the salvation and the power and the kingdom of our God and the authority of his Christ. To him who sits on the throne and to the Lamb be praise and thanks and honor and glory for ever and ever.*

Then follow a Sanctus, the Words of Institution, the Pax Domini, and Agnus Dei. After the distribution, the thanksgiving begins with a verse, "Thank the Lord and sing his praise." (An alternate hymn stanza is suggested for Lent, since the thanksgiving ends with two Alleluias). A prayer follows, and then the Aaronic benediction, introduced by the words: "Brothers and sisters, go in peace. Live in harmony with one another. Serve the Lord with gladness." A three-fold "Amen" is the congregation's response.

### **Service of the Word -**

This service is the first of three without provision for the Sacrament of the Altar. After the Apostolic (benediction) salutation, there follows a Confession of sins reminiscent of the prodigal son ("do not deserve to be called your child"), but includes both original and active sin. The absolution:

*God, our heavenly Father, has forgiven all your sins. By the perfect life and innocent death of our Lord Jesus Christ, he has removed your guilt forever. You are his own dear child. May God give you strength to live according to his will.*

The Prayer and Praise section begins with the congregation singing "Oh, taste and see that the lord is good . . ." and moves to the Prayer of the Day. The lessons follow the pattern of the first two services, with the Hymn of the Day introducing the Sermon. All stand for the Apostles' Creed following the sermon, to be seated again for the offerings. A General Prayer (responsively) precedes the Lord's Prayer and another Hymn. A Collect (not so-called) and the Benediction (prefaced the same as the previous service) conclude the service.

The last two liturgies we would briefly consider are:

### **Morning Praise (Matins) and Evening Prayer (Vespers) -**

The arrangement of these services will again be familiar to those who have become accustomed to the corresponding services in *The Lutheran Hymnal*. In the Matins an opening hymn is printed out, and the traditional versicles are used (with different music). The Vesper service offers a second opening page (Service of Light) as an option for the usual versicles and responses. The Invitatory varies with the seasons of the church year and the Venite does not include a Gloria Patri at the end. In general, the chants (Venite, Magnificat, Nunc Dimittis, and Te Deum) are much easier to follow, with one line of music for each line of words, and with no flipping back and forth of pages. The Apostolic Benediction is chanted in both the Matins and Vesper services.

Closing comments:



All in all, this reviewer finds the five orders of service quite reasonable for former users of the Synodical Conference orders of service. Were any of us to have occasion to use any of the last four liturgies, some form of introduction to the music employed might make the material less confusing and more beneficial in the service. Perhaps you have done this already with *The Lutheran Hymnal*: before the service one might go before the congregation to practice with them one of the chants, or an unfamiliar hymn, to be used in the service. When this has been tried, it was usually found that when the rehearsed portion of the worship service arrived, the singing seemed more fervent, with much less distraction by the mechanics of the new worship form.

---

# The Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Galatians

Exegesis by Dr. Joh. Ylvisaker  
Luther Seminary, Hamline, Minn. 1905  
Translation from the Norwegian by C.M. Gullerud

(Conclusion)

Part VII

Chapter V

## An admonition not to be entangled again in the yoke of bondage (1-12)

In order to make the readers aware of how sinful and fatal it would be to fall back under the yoke of bondage, Paul first of all shows that it was exactly unto freedom from the law that Christ redeemed them by His saving work.

Verse 1. The reading in the manuscripts is here somewhat different. Textus Receptus reads: *τη ελευθερια ουν η ημας Χριστος ηλευθερωσε, στηκετε*. Tischendorf reads: *τη ελευθερια ημας Χριστος ελευθερωσεν στηκετε ουν*. According to this reading the translation would be: "unto freedom Christ has bought us. Stand therefore fast." Besides the fact that this reading has the strongest critical witnesses in its favor, it must be said that it also fits better into the context. Verse 1a provides the solid support for the earnest admonition which begins with verse 1b. *τη ελευθερια* is the dat. com.: "unto or for freedom." To give the word emphasis, it is placed at the beginning. What kind of freedom is meant is shown in the following sentence. This is not the civic freedom. As good a thing as this is, it is of minor importance compared with the heavenly and eternal. Nor did Jesus come to regulate the civil government. It was freedom from the force and curse of the law that Jesus won for us by giving himself into death. The goal of Christ's redemptory work was to place us into the status of freedom, in order that we might grasp and appropriate freedom to ourselves. But then we are also to make this status into a reality in our lives, standing fast in it. *στηκετε* is the 2 pers. imper. pres. active of *στηκω*, which is formed from *εστηκα*, which is the perfect of *ιστημι* . . . (cf. Buttman, p. 41). *στηκω* is the emphatic *sto*, *firmiter sto*. *και μη παλιν . . . ενεχεσθε*, "and be not entangled again." *παλιν* points to the fact that they had been slaves

before, some under the Mosaic law; others, indeed most of them, under heathendom. Now they wanted to return to the yoke of slavery, namely Judaism, which for the Jewish Christians was a return to the status which had been theirs before conversion to Christianity, namely a return to the status in which the law lay as a yoke upon their necks (cf. Acts 15:10). For the Gentile Christians it was like going from one slavery and heathendom to another, namely Judaism (cf. 4:8,9). *ενεχεσθαι τιμι* or *εν τιμι* means to be confined, with no chance of escape. This can be referred both to the physical and ethical interpretation.

Verse 2. Here the apostle announces what the result would be for them if they again placed themselves under the yoke of bondage, of which the visible expression was circumcision: "If ye be circumcised." From this expression it is apparent that none of the Galatian Gentile Christians had submitted to circumcision. Although they had made a beginning of walking on the way of the law by observing days, etc., yet they had not yet really broken with grace. But they were on the verge, and if they permitted themselves to be circumcised the break would be complete. They should bear in mind that this matter did not concern a mere trifle. By being circumcised, (1) Christ's work would be of no profit to them (v. 2b); and (2) they would in effect have placed themselves under obligation to fulfill the whole law (v. 3). When we consider how much was at stake for them, then we can understand why Paul speaks in such a serious vein. *ιδε* is the imper. aor. of *ειδον*, used as an interjection. Ordinarily Paul uses the middle form, *ιδου*. *ιδε* as paroxytone belongs to the later Hellenistic accentuation. In the Attic Greek we find *ιδε* also as oxytone, similar to *ειπε*, *λαβε*, *ελθε*, etc. (cf. Curtius' Greek Grammar § 333:12). *ιδε* serves to call the reader's attention to the importance of that which is to follow. It is the *nota bene*. *εγω Παυλος*, "I, Paul" - against the false teachers who present circumcision as an act necessary for salvation (cf. 6:12; Acts 15:1), the apostle stakes his whole authority as apostle, as Bugge says. *εαν περιτεμνησθε*. Note that we have here in the antecedent (protasis) *εαν* with the conjunctive and in the subsequent (apodosis) the indicative of the principal *tempus*. This form of the hypothetical period is applied when one asserts or prescribes something in a predicted or expected case (cf. Curtius § 545). We therefore understand with what thoughts the apostle wrote this, *ουδεν ωφελησει*. The future tense does not here refer to something that will happen sometime in the future, but to that which will take place *eo ipso*. From the very mo-

ment that they submitted themselves to circumcision, Christ would profit them nothing. But how could the apostle use such a strong assertion? All the Jewish Christians had been circumcised and still Christ was of profit to them. Not only that, but Paul himself applied circumcision to Timothy (cf. Acts 16:3). Consequently circumcision as such could not exclude from Christ and the fruit of His works. In the new covenant of the present, circumcision has become a mere surgical act which in and of itself is an adiaphoron. But what it was in and of itself did not apply in every instance. Why not? Because false teachers required it as being necessary for salvation. In this sense it was being required of the Gentile Christians of Galatia (cf. also Acts 15:1). Therefore it became a confessional act. To those who acceded to the requirement of the false teachers, Christ was no longer the only way to salvation. But Christ must be all in all, or He becomes nothing. Here applies a big "either or." Paul had not been forced to circumcise Timothy, but he did it in freedom simply to fend off the disgust which the Jews had for the uncircumcised. He did it for the sake of his mission trip.

Verse 3. *δε* is a sign to indicate continuation. *μαρτυρομαι* is in effect *testem sumo, testem profero, testem invoco*, but is used also as synonymous with *μαρτυρω*, "to witness, to prove" (cf. Acts 20:26; Eph. 4:17). *παλιν* has been understood as pointing back to verse 2: "I testify again"; that is to say, "I give a new declaration related to the foregoing." It can therefore be understood as a repetition (thus Calov, Meyer, etc.). It has also been understood as referring back to the last time Paul visited in Galatia. Since verse 2 cannot be understood as containing a testimony, therefore the latter explanation must be the correct one. This agrees best with the content of the epistle. *αρειλετης* (fr. *αρειλω*) is "debtor," *is qui debet*, "one who owes." For one to submit to circumcision for the reason here given is, in effect, a declaration that he has not received enough in Christ's work. But if he has associated himself with this teaching that Christ's work must be supplemented with the law, then he must go the whole way and realize that he is subject to all the requirements of the law. Here the principle applies: all or nothing! The provision of the law is none other than this: "Do this and you shall live; but if you don't, you will be condemned." It clearly states that he who transgresses one commandment is guilty of all. *ολον*, "whole," stands in a position to indicate emphasis. Here there is no thought of being ex-

used. We are reminded that the Jewish Christians who were spokesmen for the necessity of circumcision on the occasion of the gathering of the apostles at Jerusalem, placed two things together, namely submission to circumcision and the keeping of the law of Moses (Acts 15:5). But it is reasonable to suppose that the false teachers in Galatia did not present the case in such terms, saying that the Christians who submitted to circumcision thereby became subject to keep the whole law. This is apparent from 6:12,13. Over against their inconsistency, Paul makes it clear that by accepting circumcision they were accepting it as necessary for salvation.

Verse 4. This verse explains even more pointedly what it means to take such a step. The subjects of *κατηργηθετε* are those who submit to circumcision. *κατηργειν* is the Latin *inefficacem reddere*, then *cessare facere, finem facere, abolere*. *απο τινος* (here *Χριστου*), to be so loosed "from one" so that one has nothing to do with him. It has this same meaning when reference is made to a thing, for instance, the law (Rom. 7:6). It is, as Philippi says, a pregnant construction for *κατηργεισθαι και χωρισεσθαι απο τινος*. Therefore Theophylact can give the meaning as *ουδεμια κοινωνιαν εχετε μετα του Χριστου*. They are destroyed as a result of leaving their previous relationship to Christ. And so Paul has not said too much in verse 2. *οιτινες*, "you who." These persons are thus characterized as such who are justified by the law. It is clear that justification is not attained by the law (cf. 3:11). Paul is here speaking of their hope and intention, and therefore *δικαιουσθε* cannot be translated in any other way than "you who want to be justified, you are fallen from grace," God's grace. In the same moment that they gave up their communion with Christ and rejected the relationship which God in Christ presented to them, in that same moment grace became foreign to them, since Christ is the mediator of grace. But if they are fallen from grace, then they have thereby also fallen back under the rule of wrath, which was the situation of all men by nature. The two sides to this verse are related to each other in this way, that the first accents the apostasy, while the second presents the grace from which they have fallen. This verse is a *dictum probans* for the possibility of apostasy. *εξεπεσατε* is the Alexandrian form for *εξεπεσιν*.

Verse 5. Here the apostle, from the standpoint of the Christian's assurance, shows what it is that Christians lose when they begin to place their trust in works of the law. It is through the Spirit by faith that the Christian awaits the hope

of righteousness, and so it is not attained by the law and its deeds. "We" is placed at the beginning for emphasis; we who still hold fast by faith and by grace, in contrast to you who walk around with your deeds of the law. *Ego et omnes fratres et quotquot in Christo sumus*, "I and all the brethren and whoever else are in Christ" (Bengel). We also seek justification but in an entirely different way than you do, namely not by the law, but through the Spirit, by faith. We understand that we have here a double contrast to the *εν νομω* of verse 4. First *πνευματι* and then *εκ πιστεως*. This contrast stands fast, as Philippi says, indicating that he who seeks righteousness by the law seeks it also *σαρκι*, by means of his own fleshly power. The Spirit is the Holy Ghost who creates this eager expectation within us, and faith is here presented as the subjective source from which the expectation flows. What is it that we are waiting for? "The hope of righteousness." When hope is here presented as something we wait for, it cannot refer to the subjective hope in the heart, faith with reference to the future; but to the objective hope, *res sperata*, that for which the subjective hope, *spes*, reaches out (cf. Col. 1:5; Rom. 8:24). And this objective hope is here nothing else than the righteousness to which Paul points. The genitive is the genitive of apposition. But when the reference is to a righteousness which is hoped for, then it cannot be other than the final righteousness which shall become the Christian's possession on judgment day, the crown of righteousness which God will give him (cf. 2 Tim. 4:8). *απεκδεχσθαι* is the Latin *assidue et patienter expectare*, the German *abwarten*, an eager awaiting which does not give up until it is attained (Rom. 8:19, 23, 25; 1 Cor. 1:7). And it is the Holy Ghost who teaches the believer to wait and helps him to persevere.

Verse 6. Here is given the proof to show that the faith mentioned in verse 5 is the subjective source. "In Christ," that is to say, in connection with Christ, through whom alone we have relationship to God, and so not by works, circumcision or uncircumcision availing nothing. The only thing which avails, *τι ισχυει*, is faith. But it should be well noted that it is not just any kind of faith, not a historical knowledge, not a faith of the mouth, but a true living faith which shows itself active in love. Thus it excludes heterodoxy to the right and the left, both work righteousness and a dead faith. This passage has been and still is used by the papacy as a proof for their teaching that it is not faith alone that justifies, not *fides sola*, but *fides*

*formata* or *fides charitate formata* (cf. Conc. Trid. Sess. VI c. 7.). As a proof for this doctrine, *ενεργουμενη* is taken as passive. The meaning would then be, "faith which is made effective, which is made alive by love" (thus Bellarmin). But *ενεργουμενη* is not passive. *ενεργεισθαι* never appears in the NT as passive (cf. Rom. 7:5; Col. 1:29; 1 Thess. 2:13; 2 Thess. 2:7; James 5:16; 2 Cor. 1:6; 4:17; Eph. 3:20). The emphasis is on *πιστις*, "faith," and not on *αγαπη*, "love." This is shown both by the word order and the context.

Bengel says: *Cum fide conjunxit v. 5 spem, nunc amorem; in his stat totus Christianismus*, "He joined hope with faith (v. 5); now love. All Christianity stands in these."

Luther: *Opera fieri dicit ex fide per charitatem, non justificari hominem per charitatem*, "He says that works are done out of faith through love, not that man is justified by love."

A. Calov: *Formatam etiam fidem apostolus refellit, cum non per charitatem formam suam accipere vel formari, sed per charitatem operosam vel efficacem esse docet. Charitatem ergo et opera non fidem constituera sed consequi et ex eadem fluere certum est*, "The apostle also refutes '*fides formata*' when he teaches that faith receives its form, or is formed, not by love, but that it works or is efficacious through love. Therefore it is certain that love and works do not constitute faith, but follow it and flow from it."

Balduin: *Dicimus, charitatem nequaquam esse formam fidei. Habet enim fides in se formam suam constituentem, notitiam et fiduciam, seu Christum apprehensum. Nullam dari potest exemplum Novi Testamenti, ubi το ενεργεισθαι passivam habeat significationem*, "We say that love is never the form of [that which constitutes] faith. For faith has its form constituted in itself, knowledge and trust, or the apprehended Christ. There is no NT example [text], where *το ενεργεισθαι* has the passive meaning."

Verse 7. At this point the apostle returns again to the readers. He can never forget that they for awhile ran well. But why did they not continue to run well? The imperfect *ετρεχετε* points out that what took place at a former time was not completed and shows that the good life lasted only for a time. What kind of a running is here alluded to? The picture is taken from the race track. Paul uses this picture in part when he speaks of the ministry of the word in their midst (cf. 2:2), and otherwise when he speaks of the Christian life. Here the latter

applies. The Christian life in faith and love is indeed a race (cf. Phil. 3:14; 2 Tim. 4:7; 1 Cor. 9:24,26). *τις υμας ενεκοψεν* is a question which indicates surprise similar to *τις υμας εβασκαυεν* in 3:1, equal to the question: "how is it possible, that . . . ? *εγκοπτω* is the Latin *incido*, "to cut off." It is often used in military language when the reference is to hinder an army's advance: *intercidenda via cursum impedio*, "I impede the course by cutting off the route." Thus in general "impede, hem in, hinder, delay." It is weaker than *ανεκοψε*, which is the reading in some manuscripts. Following this reading the translation would be: "who has forced you back?" *μη* appears ordinarily after verbs which indicate a hindrance (cf. Winer, Andover Ed., p. 604). With the infinitive *μη* indicates what, according to the will of the hindering one, shall not take place. *πειθεσθαι τιμι* is *obtemperare alicui*, "to obey one." *αληθεια*, "the truth," is the truth of the gospel, the orthodox teaching regarding salvation by grace alone without the deeds of the law or one's own merit. Thus: "who has hindered you from obeying the truth?" Paul does not ask because he did not know the answer, but he wants the readers to consider carefully who those people were who had influenced them in this matter.

Verse 8. *πεισμονη* is a word that appears only here in the NT. It must be derived from *πειθω*. The church fathers use it often, and with them it has a double meaning, as for example *εχθρος*, an active (persuasion) and a passive (obedience). Since *πειθω* is used in the immediately preceding phrase, it would seem natural to take *πεισμονη* in the sense of "obedience." O. Hofmann and others take it this way. But one would then expect a closer identification of the one to whom obedience should be rendered. Since no one is mentioned, one should take the word in the active sense. Paul, then, is saying that the Galatian Christians have been the objects of persuasion and he can now tell them that the persuasion is not from him who called them, namely, God. The present participle in *του καλουντος* is not to be understood concerning an enduring call in contrast to the one in 1:6 which occurred once in the past. The participle stands here with the substantive article and so the element of time must be left out of consideration. It is God as the calling one who shall be set forth (cf. Winer l.c., p. 353).

Verse 9. By means of a proverb which Paul also used in 1 Corinthians 5:6, the apostle warns his readers against making the smallest concession to the false teachers. But what is meant here by the leaven? Does Paul refer to something abstract, as did



Jesus when He warned His disciples against the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees (cf. Matt. 16:6ff.), or is he speaking of something concrete? If it is the latter, is he thinking of the comparatively few false teachers, who if they gain entrance, could easily destroy the congregations since their words would at like a canker (cf. 2 Tim. 2:17)? It is thus understood by Bengel, Wieseler, V. Hofmann, Zahn, and others; likewise Theodoret, Jerome, and Augustine of the ancient church. Chrysostom, Theophilus, and later Luther, Meyer, Philippi, and others believe that Paul, like Jesus, was referring to doctrine. The doctrine of these Judaizers is a leaven which like all false doctrine is a leaven, partly because it is profane and the leaven referred to anything unclean or profane, in the OT, and partly because it has an innate power of infection. According to its inherent power, the error, though it seems small, will not stand still until it has destroyed all Christian doctrines, since it infects one article of faith after another, which are all joined together into one entity. Therefore, as Luther warns, it is necessary to oppose every error. The Galatians were to see to it that they did not take this matter lightly. Here there was a great danger. But although Paul is aware of this and has to call attention to it, he does not give up the hope that they will take heed and return to the way upon which they had run so well. This confidence is expressed in verse 10.

Verse 10. *εγω*, "I," is placed first for emphasis. "I, the apostle of Jesus Christ; I, your teacher; I for my part still have confidence in you, even though I understand how you have been taken in by false teachers who have sought to entangle you in their nets." *εν κυριω*, "in the Lord," - the confidence which he says he has in the readers rests in the Lord; for he found his hope in the Lord's preserving power of grace. The Lord will see to it that his hope is not put to shame. He will give victory to His truth, for the power of His truth is mightier than that of the deceivers. *ουδεν αλλο φρονησετε*, "that ye will be none otherwise minded." *φρονειν* means the view as a determining factor for their entire practical conduct. The future tense refers to the reception of the epistle and the time when they will make a definite decision. But what is the apostle pointing to when he says: "none otherwise minded"? Is it what he has written in the epistle against Judaism, against a relapse under the law, about justification by faith alone, etc.? (Thus Luther, Winer, Olshausen, Philippi, and others.) Or is it obedience to the truth in verse 7? (Thus Wieseler, V. Hofmann.) Or the warning

which he issued to them in verses 8,9? (Thus Meyer.) Or the chief thought in verses 7-9, indicating that the Galatians were by the Judaizers led away from the truth which they previously possessed, led to walk on dangerous ways? (Thus Siefert.) If we take the context into consideration, then we will see that Paul is referring to that which he calls leaven and one's attitude to it. Paul expresses his confidence that the readers will recognize as leaven what he has identified as such and see to it, as true Christians, that it is expunged and that honor be given to the truth by accepting it and following it in all things. This interpretation agrees with the following. ο δε παρασων, "but he that troubles." δε is the adversative: with you it shall be otherwise than with the deceivers. Paul uses the singular, not thereby indicating *totum genus*, "the whole class," nor because he is thinking of some specific person as leader or the false teachers; but he is thereby individualizing the deceivers. He takes the individual out of the flock and addresses the following to him. He shall bear his judgment, κριμα, God's wrath executed in time and eternity. This judgment is pictured as a burden which the guilty one carries from the judgment seat where he has met the righteous judge. Thus the most crushing blow is administered.

Verse 11. How does it come that Paul speaks as he does here? Has someone accused him of preaching circumcision? Evidently this had happened. We know that the Judaizing opponents accused him of many evil things. At one time they accused him of voiding the law (Rom. 3:31); at another time that he spoke lightly of sin, even encouraging people to sin in order that grace might shine the brighter (Rom. 3:8). Here in Galatia they also sought to confuse the Christians by picturing Paul as one who, in their case, spoke severely against circumcision while, on the other hand, advocating it in other places, even preaching it to others. Presumably these heretics pointed to the circumcision of Timothy and perhaps other similar instances not recorded. These instances they have distorted, seeking to prove that in other instances Paul had considered circumcision as necessary for salvation. Error is itself a lie and those who harbor error have a "reactive conscience" proceeding to tell lies and to practice deception concerning witnesses of the truth. This is demonstrated as an every day experience. But in opposition to such "spiteful lies," as Bugge rightly calls them, Paul does not spend any time in presenting an answer. Such lies are not worth it. He appeals to the persecutions which he suffers at the hands

of those who are of the circumcision. This had to be the most striking testimony to show that he could not be preaching circumcision as being necessary to salvation. From all this it should be clear that the weapons of the opponents were "rusty weapons." *ετι* is the temporal "still" and refers to the time of the apostle's conversion, not to the beginning of his ministry as an apostle of Jesus Christ. As an apostle he never preached that circumcision was necessary for salvation, although he likely did while he was still a *ζηλωτης του νομου*. The second *ετι* has been taken to be logical, so that the thought would be: "what cause do they **however** have for persecuting me? But there is no reason to take the *ετι* as having different meanings in the two phrases. The apostle is asking in the second phrase why he would still be persecuted if he preached circumcision. They would then have no reason to continue persecuting him; for the offense of the cross would then be removed. *αρα, igitur*, "therefore," *rebus sic habentibus*, "this being the case." The genitive, "of the cross," is the defining genitive, namely the existing offense of the cross. The cross is a metonymical designation for the salvation which was effected by the cross (cf. 1 Cor. 1:17). This salvation through Christ was, as it always is, an offense for all Pharisaic-minded persons who will not give up the works of the law, their own merit, their own natural power. The very word "cross" expresses the deepest humiliation for Jesus while the Jews expected that the Messiah would come as a glamorous "sign" (cf. 1 Cor. 1:22). The death on the **cross** was then an offense (*σκανδαλον*) for the Jews. But the sting of the *σκανδαλον* would be removed for these Judaizers if they were permitted to place their hope of salvation in part upon circumcision and the law. But when Christ's death on the cross was preached as the only way to salvation, then both circumcision and the law were completely removed from the way of salvation; then there wouldn't be any ground for salvation in themselves. The only ground would be in God, which would find them crawling to the cross with salvation subjectively coming to them by grace alone through faith, *sola gratia, sola fide*. But this exclusivity which the cross pronounced was the great *σκανδαλον* which stirred up and brought forth the inner opposition. Now if Paul preached circumcision, then this *σκανδαλον* would be removed, as each one would be referred to himself, his own strength and fitness retaining some part of the honor. *σκανδαλον* is a word which exclusively belongs to Biblical and churchly terminology. LXX uses the word as a translation of

the Hebrew מַכְשָׁר (tendicula, "a little snare") and מַכְשָׁר , consequently really "a trap," *quodvis offendicutum in via positum in quo si quis offendit, titubet vel cadat necesse est* (Grimm), "something to trip over placed in the way, so that if someone stumbles over it he must totter or fall." According to church usage offense is a moral snare effecting a moral damage and fall. There is a distinction between giving and taking offense. Here the latter is meant.

Verse 12. This wish which the apostle here expresses shows his great wrath over against the seducers who had wreaked such great damage. *οφελον* is properly a strong aorist without the augment, derived from *οφειλω*, "I ought," but it is here to be understood as a plain interjection, "would that," and this is also written with the augment, *ωφελον*. It is usually connected with the indicative especially in the imperfect and aorist, but also with the future as is here the case. *ωφελον* is seldom connected with the present optative. *αποκοπτειν* means to cut off, amputate, emasculate. How is it to be understood here? The ancient interpreters, e. g., Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecolampadius, Ambrosius, Theophilus, Augustine, Jerome, and others, take the word in the meaning, "to castrate." Thus also a number of the later interpreters, such as Winer, Olshausen, V. Hofmann, Meyer, Siefert, Zahn, and others. They interpret *αποκοφονται* as future middle and maintain that in the NT it does not appear in the future passive. *αποκοπτειν* is used both in classical Greek and in LXX in the sense of castration. The meaning would then be: "Oh, that others who are so zealous for circumcision would not only circumcise themselves, but would right out castrate themselves." The apostle expresses the wish that the deceivers in their zeal for holiness would go so far as to castrate themselves. Then the people would realize that there was something wrong here, and the deceivers would no longer be a threat to the upright. Luther, most ancient Lutheran interpreters, and newer ones, such as Wieseler, take *αποκοφονται* in the passive sense. Thus also our older church translations. The meaning would then be: "Would that they might be cut off in the sense of being excommunicated, expelled from the congregation or in such a way that they are entirely rooted out." It must be said that there are a number of things which favor the interpretation of the old church. That the Greek interpreters have taken the word in the sense of castration is not without weight. That the word in other passages in the NT does not appear in the future passive has also something in its favor, though this does not

provide a conclusive decision; for though the middle future of the word does not appear in other places in the NT, it could still be the case here, since we know that though the middle future also outside of the NT as a rule has mediate meaning, the passive meaning also occurs (cf. Curtius, l.c., 266). But it is more important to see that with *και*, "even," a rising note is indicated which would be lost with the passive of *αποκοπτω*, and that in this predicate there must be indicated an allusion to circumcision which involves the foreskin of the male organ. *αναστατουυ* is stronger than *ταρασσειν*, which is earlier used of the false teachers. *αναστατουυ*, which is associated with the later readings, corresponds with the older *αναστατον ποειν* and means "to trouble (agitate)."

#### **An admonition against misuse of evangelical liberty (13-26)**

The life of the believer is a life in freedom, not in bondage. And this liberty is the precious jewel which he does not want to be taken from him. But the believer's life is also a life of love to God and His Word and to the neighbor. It is a sanctified life which is indicated and determined by the Holy Ghost. It flees works of the flesh and strives to produce fruits of the Spirit. Liberty thus has its rights as well as the necessary limits, quite different from the unbridled looseness of the flesh. God's word is here the norm at all times and love becomes my master which is dear to me. But the pure service of love it is which reveals my true liberty.

Verse 13. With *γαρ*, "for," this verse is marked as the basis for the preceding. *υμεις*, "you," has a position giving emphasis. The brethren are placed into contrast with the troublemakers. The meaning then is this: with perfect right I am, in anger, speaking of the troublemakers; because you are the objects of their oppression under the law and are called of God to an entirely different life style, namely to a life of freedom. *επι* denotes the purpose of the call (cf. 1 Thess. 4:7; Eph. 2:10), but therein lies also the intention that the goal should be reached. The freedom here spoken of is not of a civic nature, but it is spiritual, freedom from the force and curse of the law, freedom from the guilt and rule of sin. This is a state in which a Christian serves the Lord in liberty, with a will which does not look upon the will of God as a strange thing, but agrees with the will of God out of a reborn heart. But this does not exclude the fact that he still has the flesh and therefore needs the

law as a rule. *μονον μη*, "(use) not," introduces the boundary within which freedom is exercised. *εχηπε* is to be supplied. *αφορμη* is "occasion." *τη σαρκι*, "for the flesh." Freedom is a freedom merely for the reborn spirit. The flesh, the old man, is to be chastised and tamed. *αλλα δουλευετε αλληλοις*, "but serve one another," evidently as slaves. But how can freedom be compared with service as slaves? Love provides the answer. The service of love to the neighbor will not be felt as a heavy burden by the reborn man. On the contrary, the service of love is the desire of the reborn life and is considered as a free act by the regenerate. "In love a person is likewise free as a servant . . . It is acknowledged that there can be no greater assignment for a creature than to serve his Creator and his brethren in free and blessed love. The Christian liberty does not exist as a separate entity so that one simply carries out his own will, but on the contrary it consists in this that one denies himself and submits to God and so in love becomes the slave of all the brethren."

Through Paul's earnest warning and admonition and the background for it, we get to see another side to the condition of the Galatian congregation than that which the letter has so far laid before us. It seems that some members of the congregations had absorbed antinomistic views. Presumably they were the Pauline Christians who wanted to hold fast to the apostle's doctrine. They had begun to show effects of the pressure exerted by the adherents of the Judaistic false followers of the law. Thereby they were being pressured into an opposite extremity. They were feeling that they had been too free by not taking the law's commandment seriously enough and in particular with regard to the law of love which is the summary of the law. They have in pride raised themselves up over the weak brethren and have dealt with them in severity instead of seeking to win them by the exercise of love. On the other side, those who were taken in by a false legalism did not take heed to the inner spiritual requirement of the law. As is so often the case, they had restricted their view of the law merely to an external, outward observance. So dissension and factionalism had risen among them (cf. v. 15 and 6:1,2).

Verse 14. At the same time that Paul in the foregoing gives the antinomians something to think about, he is here delivering a strong *argumentum ad hominem* against the nomists (legalists). They desired to adhere to the law. Good and well, Paul is saying to them: here is the requirement of the law, a mighty word: Love your neighbor as yourself! This re-

quirement is of such a nature that he who fulfills it has kept the whole law, the whole Mosaic law. The perfect *πεπληρωται* is saying that hereby the law is fulfilled and all is accomplished (cf. Rom. 13:8). *πληροῦν* is to fulfill, perfect, "not "to sum up" (cf. Rom. 8:4; 13:8; Matt. 3:15; Acts 14:26). *ἐν τῷ*, "in this." *ἀγαπήσεις*, "you shall love," is the future imperative. In Romans 13:8ff. Paul gives a commentary of what is said in this verse. Even as Paul expresses himself regarding love to the neighbor as it relates to the law, even so does James in his letter (2:8) when he writes that the "royal law" is fulfilled in this: "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." But how does this agree with Jesus' statement that the command to love the neighbor is the second commandment which is like unto "the first and great commandment" to love God (cf. Matt. 22:40; Mark 12:31)? These two commandments are joined together so that one cannot be fulfilled without the other. Love to the neighbor presupposes and flows out of love to God. Love to God is the source and root of love to the neighbor. Besides that, we love the neighbor when we love God (cf. 1 John 3:17; 4:20; 5:2).

Verse 15. Love to the neighbor is the keeping of the law. This is shown in the foregoing. But the situation among the Galatians with regard to the fulfillment of this law is not good even among those who wanted to hold themselves to the law. The very opposite is revealed among them. They were threatening to rob each other of life in God in lack of love and through a party spirit which, in its various violent forms, is now pictured as the behavior of wild animals. "Biting," "devouring" and "consuming" are pictured in climactic relationship to each other. *αναλισκῶ* is the Latin *consumo*, our "devour." We understand that there had been quarrelsomeness among them. There were those among them who had been very loose with truth and justice. There had been plenty of harsh criticism, judgmentalism and contempt for others, and this mind set had hindered a careful examination of the truth. In the following list of "deeds of the flesh" there are no less than nine which can be categorized as trouble-making sins, as a result of the lack of love to the neighbor. Wieseler has the following striking description: "How severely the apostle castigates such loveless quarreling when he likens the guilty ones to wild, ravenous animals! And yet people act as if this sharp apostolic word was not contained in Scripture when one sees how believers in our age in loveless zeal tear each other and the

church apart not considering what a terrible guilt they have brought upon themselves."

Verse 16. But how shall we learn to treat one another in brotherly love instead of destroying like raging animals? What course shall we choose in order to attain this desirable goal? "Walk in the Spirit," says the apostle, "and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh." *πνευμα* is interpreted by several as the objective Spirit, the Holy Ghost. The dative, *πνευματι*, must then be a dative of active power. "Walk in the Holy Spirit, who lives in you and now gives power for the new life in daily sanctification." But those interpreters must be right who maintain that because of the connection of this verse with verse 18 the "spirit" must mean the subjective spirit, the spirit sanctified by the Holy Ghost, the new man. In this sense the word spirit is often used in contrast to flesh (cf. 3:3; 6:8; Rom. 8:4-6,9). The dative would then be dative of manner, as in 3:3. They should simply let the new spiritual life come into its own right to be the guiding principle for their life's journey. Then there will be no want of love, for the essence of the new spiritual life is an essence in love which the God of love has created. Hold then to the opposite of the self-loving flesh. *και ου μη*, "then ye shall not," fulfill the lust of the flesh. After an imperative phrase, the copula *και* with *ου μη* indicates the future result. *τελειν*, "to fulfill," points to fulfilling sinful desires. In parallel phrases we have *ποιειν* with practically the same meaning (cf. Eph. 2:3; John 8:44).

Verse 17. Here the apostle proves that a walking in the spirit shuts out a perfecting of the deeds of the flesh; for to be characterized by one of these life styles destroys a rule by the other. One cannot serve both masters at the same time. "Flesh" is the old man. It never changes. Its desire and delight is the same whether in the reborn or in the unregenerate. It walks in an opposite direction from that of the spirit, and vice versa. "Spirit" must be the new man as the determining principle of the regenerate, the real I (Rom. 7:16ff.). *επιθυμειν*, "to lust," which is so often used in the NT in an evil sense, is here *vox media*, "a neutral term," since it is also used of the spirit which only wills what is good. *κατα*, "against." *ταυτα*, "these," are the specific life principles and strengths. *αντικειται*, "in conflict with each other, each other's enemy." The following phrase with *ινα* must not be understood as consequence or purpose as such, but as consequence according to the thought. That the attempt has been made to look upon this sentence as expressing a



consequence is due to a misunderstanding. Paul has said that these two, the spirit and the flesh are against each other, enemies, which oppose each other with the purpose that you cannot do what you want, namely thus: when the flesh seeks to have its will carried out, then the spirit opposes it in order that it may not be done; and on the other hand when the spirit wants its will to be done, the flesh does likewise in opposing it. Paul in this instance is not saying which of these forces attains its goal. He here merely places before us the irreconcilable opposition separating them. If one should refer the *ψυχη* merely to one life principle, then one could just as well understand it of the flesh as of the spirit in such a way, for instance, that the flesh opposes the spirit in order that you shall not do what you want to do according to the new man. But this one sided view is ruled out here because *ψυχη* refers to *παντα*, which refers to both flesh and spirit.

Verse 18. *δε*, "but," presents a further statement which was called forth by the nomistic tendencies of many of the readers. Here the reference is to the Holy Ghost. If He is the driving and moving force in you, then you are not under the law like a slave under a strict taskmaster, but you are free; for where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. You are free, not in the sense of being without law nor against the law, but you are under law to Christ (1 Cor. 9:21). You perform the requirements of the law with delight and joy. The law does not stand over you as a driving, cursing and judging force. The requirements of the law and the desire of the new man are in harmony. For the regenerate the law is a dear friend and companion which tells him what God's will is.

Verses 19-21. Paul first speaks of the works of the law which are manifest. *φανερὰ* is placed at the beginning for emphasis. *δε*, "now," is explicative. The genitive *τῆς σαρκὸς*, "of the flesh," is the subjective genitive, the deeds which proceed from the flesh when the flesh is the ruling power. Flesh here is to be taken in the ethical sense, the corrupt human nature. The following catalog of the deeds of the flesh can be divided into four groups. These stand in relation to each other in this way that the first and fourth, which belong to the category of sins of the flesh, provide a frame for the second and third, which include godlessness and strife.

(1) Sins of lust, leading to and including *πορνεία*, "fornication," is the Latin *scortatio*, unchastity in general which expresses itself in deeds. *ακαθαρσία*, "uncleanness," is lust

in a wider sense, lust in thought and desire as well as in deed (cf. Rom. 1:24; 2 Cor. 12:21). *ασελγεια*, lust from the point of view of that which transcends the boundaries of decency, impudence, shamelessness which could be rendered wantonness, sensuality (cf. Rom. 13:13; 2 Cor. 12:21; Eph. 4:19).

(2) Sins against the honor of God. This group is designated by the two words *ειδωλατρεια* and *φαρμακεια*. The first of these is pure and simple idolatry. To this belongs the Christian's participation in the idolatrous meat sacrifices against which Paul warns so earnestly in 1 Corinthians 10:14ff. The heathenish idolatrous feasts were so often associated with orgies; therefore this group is naturally connected with the foregoing. *φαρμακεια* is often used of poisonous potions, but also of witchcraft in general (cf. Rev. 9:21; 18:23). Idolatry and witchcraft are mentioned together in several passages in the OT (cf. Deut. 18:10ff.; Ex. 22:18), and in Asia Minor the two sins go hand in hand (cf. Acts 19:19).

(3) Sins of strife which lead to and include *φονοι*, "murder." This entire group comprises sins against love to the neighbor. The first mentioned, *εχθρα*, *inimicitia*, "enmity," is a more general conception; the others are special open forms of the same. The first four, including *θυμοι*, "wrath," point to strife in connection with the individual, and the three subsequent ones, "strife, seditions, heresies," refer to trouble in society. *ερις* is *contentio*, *rixa*, "discord," and *ζηλος* is really *animi fervor*, "fervor of spirit," but furthermore also *invidiosa et contentiosa aemulatio*, "jealousy, envy." Some manuscripts have the plural *ερεις* and *ζηλοι*. Thus Paul must here be pointing to the different forms in which these sins express themselves. *θυμος* is wrath, but is distinguished somewhat from *οργη*. *οργη* is a specific wrath in and by itself, *ira inveterata*, but *θυμος*, from *θυω*, points to wrath which boils over into bitterness, hot-headedness, turbulent commotion (Trench), the agitation of the feelings. Therefore in some passages we may have *θυμος της οργης* (cf. Rev. 16:19; 19:15), fierceness by his wrath. *εριθεια*, "strife," is rendered "*Partei und Raenkesucht*" ("faction and intrigue") by Grimm, and Siefert has "*selbtsuechtige Partei-cabbalen*," ("self-seeking party-cabals"). The word points to party-minded strife which is not so particular about the means. *διχαστασια*, *dissidium*, *factio*, "divisions" (cf. Rom. 16:17; 1 Cor. 3:3). *αρσεις* from *αρω*, *actus capiendi*, *captio*, ("the act of taking," "seizure"), but is used in later Greek with the meaning of heresy as in 2 Peter 2:1 and then also here

as "factions," which is the result of divisions which have been brought about in larger or smaller circles (cf. 1 Cor. 11:19). *φθονος* is *invidia*, "envyings," and *θονος*, "murder." The last mentioned word is omitted by Tischendorf since it is not included in a number of manuscripts. But it is, however, easier to think that it was omitted than that it was added. If it is genuine then we have the same *paranomasia* as in Romans 1:19.

(4) To this group belong the sins of intemperance such as drinking, rioting, sins which militate against one's own self respect. *μεθη*, "drunkenness," *ebrieta*, and *κωμος* (from *κειμαι*), *comisatio*, "reveling," orgies, especially at night (cf. 1 Pet. 4:3). *και τα ομου*, "and the like," such deeds of the flesh of a similar nature which are now recounted. *προ* in *προλεγω* and *προειπον* has the meaning of "previous," namely previous to the things which happened. On the last day the judgment will take place. The past tense points to Paul's oral testimony while he was with them. When he now foretells what will happen he is not coming with anything new. Regarding *βασιλειαν Θεου κληρονομησουσιν*, cf. 1 Corinthians 6:9,10; 15:50; Ephesians 5:5; James 2:5. Consequently, all the deeds of the flesh which have been reconciled and other of similar character lead to one result, exclusion from the inheritance which is God's kingdom according to its full visible revelation as the kingdom of glory, the completion of that which is now invisibly present in the souls and hearts from its beginning. The fathers have here made this striking remark: "By good deeds we do not merit eternal life, but by evil deeds we exclude ourselves from it."

Verse 22. While the apostle in the foregoing section recounted sins of the flesh against which the Galatians needed to be warned, he now, in the following, as a contrast, lists deeds which they ought to be performing. These are comprised under the heading *ο καρπος*, "fruit." Here we have the singular while in the preceding we had the plural "deeds." Paul did not here make an inadvertent slip, nor did it happen for the sake of making a harmonious sound. Paul wishes to emphasize the inner unity tying together the good deeds in contrast to the many kinds of evil deeds. Bengel makes this striking remark: "*opera in pluralis quia divisa sunt et saepe inter se pugnancia. At fructus in singulari quia conjunctus et concors*," "the works [of the flesh] are many, for they are scattered and often contesting among themselves. But the fruit [of the spirit] is singular, for it is united and in agreement." Fruit is the word now used and not the word deed, because these deeds are not performed by

a power which is man's natural property but by a power which is provided by another, namely the Spirit, the Holy Ghost; therefore they are designated as the fruit of the Spirit. All of them belong to one group. *εγκρατεια*, "temperance," stands in contrast to sins of the flesh. As a heading to the deeds of the Christians the apostle placed *αγαπη*, "love," because this is the chief part which must be the heart and soul of what follows. In Romans 15:30 it is called *αγαπη του πνευματος*. The next deed is "joy," the soul's glad fearlessness in the knowledge of God's love and in the assurance of the glory of eternal life, in so far as this joyous fearlessness proceeds from association with others, "cheerfulness in conversation with others." This is the gift of the Spirit (cf. 1 Thess. 1:6). *ειρηνη*, "peace," is not the inner peace and joy of conscience through the assurance of the gracious forgiveness of sins, but as a deed, the peaceful and peace-producing association with others (cf. Rom. 12:18). The people filled with this spirit are they whom Jesus calls blessed when He says: "Blessed are the peacemakers" (Matt. 5:9). *μακροθυμια*, "longsuffering," which is not quick to insist on rights (James 1:19), the opposite of *θυμος*. *χρηστοτης* is "gentleness" (2 Cor. 6:6; Col. 3:12) and *αγαθωσυνη*, "goodness." These deeds are related to each other, but are distinguished from each other in this way that the first word sets forth the deed of doing good to another, while the second sets forth that what one does for another is always good. *πιστις* is in the NT generally used in the sense of faith, most often of subjective faith, *fides qua creditur*. But the place it here occupies in the midst of Christian deeds makes it clear that one cannot understand it here as referring to saving faith, *fides salvifica*; but the deed of keeping one's promise, one's obligations, faithfulness, dependency (cf. Matt. 23:23; Rom. 3:3; Tit. 2:10).

Verse 23. *πραυτης* is "meekness," related to *μακροθυμια* with this difference that while *πραυτης*, so to say, does not know wrath, it excludes it, then *μακροθυμια* holds it in abeyance, postpones it, is "slow to wrath." *εγκρατεια*, "temperance," is a sweeping designation of the spirit-wrought purity of life in contrast to the sins of lust in the foregoing. *κατα των τουτουτων* in our church translation is rendered "against such." *τουτουτων* can be either neuter or masculine. A number of interpreters take it as a neuter on account of *τα τουταυτα* in verse 21. But von Hofman calls attention, correctly, to the fact that it would be more than superfluous for Paul to say that the law is not against the love which, of course, constitutes the principle commandment of

the law, like joy and peace, etc. Besides, the reference is not to deeds as described in the above. After reference to them, *τοιαντα* "such things," followed. But here deeds are spoken of in such a way that their unity as a "fruit" are presented. It is natural to take *των τοιουτων* as masculine and render it "such" or "such like." Thus it was understood by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophilus, later Luther, Bengel, and others. Paul is saying that the law is not against such who bear fruit of the Spirit. They are motivated by the Spirit and are not under the law. Those who are under the law always have the law against them; but those who are free from the law and are under grace and thus carry out God's will from inner desire have the law on their side as a dear companion, showing the Father's will to His children.

Verse 24. This is a pun. Those who belong to Christ stand with Him in fellowship of life. They bear the fruit of the Spirit and do not have the law against them. They have the flesh indeed, but they have crucified it. This occurred when they accepted the faith and were baptized, therefore the aorist *εσταυρωσαν*. They have done the same to their evil flesh as Jesus suffered on the cross in His flesh, His true human nature. His flesh, His body, was then nailed to the cross. He was not free to leave it. Thus the believers have nailed the old man with its evil lusts and desires to the cross, so that the old man cannot free himself. *παθηματα* are the passions of sin (cf. Rom. 7:5) and *επιθυμια* are the results of such passions. But although the old man was crucified, he is not dead. Therefore the process of crucifying and mortifying the flesh must continue all of our days (cf. Eph. 4:22; Col. 3:9; Rom. 8:13). Just as conversion in the wider sense, *poenitentia magna*, does not exclude but much more includes daily sorrow and repentance, so also here with crucifixion and mortification. Therefore Luther says that the Christian life is nothing else than "*ein Anheben seliglich zu sterben, von der Taufe an bis ins Grab*," "a beginning of a blessed dying, from Baptism on to the grave."

Verse 25. But if it be so that we bear the fruit of the Spirit, that we belong to Christ, are spiritual and have the Spirit as our principle of life, as a driving force, then we must let our journey through life be determined by the Spirit, letting Him lead and direct us on the right path. The first dative, *πνευματι*, is dative of manner; the other is the norming dative. It does happen often that one may be living in the Spirit without letting one's whole life style be directed by the Spirit, but this will be an anomalous situation which a Christian must

continually struggle to remove. *στοιχειν*, which is used here, is distinguished from *περιπατειν* in verse 16 by virtue of the different picture that is involved. *στοιχειν* is *ordine procedere*, "marching," with reference to the exact time and the definite course laid out by another, while *περιπατειν* simply means "to go, to walk," *ambulare*. It is for a purpose that the apostle here uses the word *στοιχειν*.

Verse 26. Baumgartner, Crusius, Olshausen, Meyer, V. Hofmann, and others combine this verse with the following chapter. However it must be said that there is more reason to combine it with the preceding. Both form (cf. *ζωμεν, στοιχωμεν - γινωμεθα*) and content point back. In the next chapter we have a new address and a transfer to the second person. *κενοδοξος* (from *κενος* and *δοξα*) is the Latin *vanam gloriam captans, vanae gloriae cupidus*, "desire for empty, vain honor." *μη γινωμεθα*, "let us not become." The exhortation appears in communicative form. In deep humility Paul includes himself with the rest. The readers are not to suppose that he considers himself free from desire for vain glory and the evils which follow with it. With this approach he can more easily get a hearing among them. It is also an indication of his pedagogic wisdom. The two participles, *προκαλουμενοι* and *φθουουμενοι* point out two principal evils which are found among those who seek after empty honor among men more than they seek the honor of God. *προκαλειν* is the middle voice, "to provoke, to challenge, to egg on," with the thought that by challenging there will be opportunity to come forth triumphant and thus shining in the eyes of others. He who has a passion for honor will always be striving to be "the first chicken in the coop," not tolerating any one along side of him. Anyone who challenges his position will at any rate be labeled as being envious of him, and for the most part such jealousy becomes occasion for animosity and persecution. If one is to escape the nasty voice of envy, it is necessary in all humility to regard others better than himself (Phil. 2:3). *φθουειν* stands here with the dative; the verb can also be found with the accusative in the infinitive, but never with the simple accusative. The reading *αλληλους* found in some manuscripts must therefore be regarded as erroneous.

## Chapter VI

### **An admonition to walk in brotherly harmony and love (1-10)**

Paul had concluded the preceding section with a warning against pride and the passion for honor which generates strife and discord among those who should be united. In contrast thereto he now admonishes the readers, in consciousness of their own weakness bearing his burden with him, thus fulfilling the law of Christ which proclaims unselfish and devoted love (vv. 1-5). He especially admonishes them to show love to the ministers of the Word, sharing their good things with them (v. 6). With continual regard for the judgment to come, they are to commit themselves to the doing of good to all men, but especially to those of the household of faith (vv. 7-10).

Verse 1. With the affectionate address, "brethren," the apostle opens this section in which he so earnestly implores them to exercise brotherly love. *εαν και*, "if indeed," in which case *και* is here climactic. *προλημφοθη* from *προλαμβανεσθαι* which the Vulgate translates *praeoccupari*. Luther renders it "uebereilt werden," "be overtaken, or surprised," indicating something that happens unexpectedly (*προ*), before the person involved is able to draw back or change the situation (cf. Wisdom 17:17). The best of ancient and modern interpreters refer this to rash sins, *peccatum praecipitantis*. *εν τινι παραπτωματι* cannot mean "by or of some trespass." The preposition *εν* like the Hebrew  $\beth$  can be instrumental and indicate the means or instrument by which a person does something, but cannot emphasize the active subject by a passive verb. We must therefore render it "in some sin." The sin is looked upon as a pit into which one falls. The causal subject is not mentioned. It must be either the flesh or Satan. The meaning then is this: it refers to a person, such as you or me, who still has the evil human nature, who in an unguarded moment, is carried away into a sin. V. Hofmann connects this with *κενοδοξαι* in the foregoing and finds the apostle's meaning to be this: the brother's sin provides an opportunity to exalt oneself above him. He translates *προλημφοθη* with "ueber etwas ergriffen werden," "to be caught at something." The thought would be that here the reference is to one who is overtaken in a sin, caught in the act, like a thief who is apprehended in his theft. Though this interpretation of *προλαμβανεσθαι* can be defended, it would seem that the context does not favor it. One would have to expect *καταλαμβανω*, and one can hardly think that Paul would here be giving an admonition not to exalt himself above another since it is rather an admonition to help the brother. *καταρτισειν* is *integrum facere*, "to mend, to adjust" (cf. Matt.

4:21). *πνευματικοί*, "spiritual," you who have the Holy Ghost, who has regenerated you to become new creatures. The word refers back to 5:25 and 22. The opposite of *πνευματικοί* is *σαρκικοί* or *ψυχικοί*, "carnal" (cf. I Cor. 2:13; 3:1). In the foregoing section Paul admonished to walk in the Spirit, and as fruit of the Spirit Paul had mentioned meekness. Here he provides an instance in which they could practice meekness. "Spirit" must here refer to the spiritual mood of Christian meekness. (See Luther, Phillipi, and others.) Others have taken spirit as referring to the Holy Ghost, who creates meekness. But the thought must here be the same as in 1 Corinthians 4:21, where the spirit of meekness cannot be the Holy Ghost, for He is the one who creates love; and Paul could not then have written *εν αγαπη πνευματι τε πραυτητος* but *εν πνευματι αγαπης πραυτητος τε*.

*σκοπων σεαυτον*, "looking to yourself," being on your guard, that also you—namely like your brother—are not tempted, namely to do evil. The second person plural is here, as so often in Greek, exchanged for second person singular. The individualizing here is for the sake of emphasis (cf. Winer l.c., p. 579f.). You are also exposed to temptation since you have the natural flesh. It is therefore important that one should be mindful of himself. Each one of us has good reason to approach the guilty one with meekness, not then as one who exalts himself and is frivolous over the brother's sin, but rather as one who sorrows over him. If you have been preserved from falling, you have God to thank for that.

Verse 2. The apostle, having in verse 1 admonished the spiritual to demonstrate a loving attitude toward the erring brother, here admonishes them to show him the basic fulfilling love which is willing to bear every burden with him. *τα βαρη*, "burden," is that which presses down upon the brother, whether it be inner or outer things, bodily or spiritual in nature such as disaster, sickness, poverty, or distress involving sin. But special reference is to the already-mentioned sins of weakness, the common deficiencies and faults. These burdens of another we are to bear, not just tolerate, but truly shoulder them after the example of Christ who took upon Him our infirmities and bare our sicknesses (Matt. 8:17). *βασταζειν* has the same meaning as in 5:10; 6:17; Matthew 10:12; Acts 15:10; Romans 15:1. Believers are united in the most intimate fellowship, for they are members of the same body. When one member suffers, the others suffer with him (cf. 1 Cor. 12:26). Love binds them together so that the suffering of one is felt by the other and brings him



such pain as though it was his own. Since this is the case he would want the pain to be diminished or taken away completely. Thus also here with regard to the burden. My love to the brother causes me to regard his burden as resting not only on his shoulders, but also on mine, and I shall by word and deed, by advice and action, help him to bear it, seeking to relieve the weight or take it away altogether, doing it all with compassion and participation. *και ουτως*, "and so," namely in the aforementioned way I shall fulfill the law of Christ. The OT law had its summary, its point of unity in the law of love to the neighbor. Christ has one law which draws all together into one unity, namely "Love one another" (John 13:34f.; Matt. 22:37f.). This is "the royal law" (James 2:8). *αναπληρου* is the intensified *πληρου* and points to a complete fulfillment. Tischendorf and all the ancient translations have the future *αναπληρωσετε*, according to the best manuscripts. Many, yes, the majority of the codices nevertheless have the reading of aorist imperative *αναπληρωσατε*. But this reading is nevertheless considered as a copyist's error which was introduced in following the imperative of the preceding.

Verse 3. As a basis for the preceding it must be said that he who would practice indulgence to another must first evaluate himself in all humility. He who thinks himself to be something when he in truth is nothing, deceives himself and is far from keeping the law of Christ. Pride is the greatest hindrance to our being unto others what we ought to be. *φρευαπαταν* is not found in classical Greek and only here in the NT. The word comes from *φρευαπατης* (Tit. 1:10) and means to lead one's judgment out on a wrong track. When we consider that the good that we have is a gift from God, then it is apparent that it is a self-delusion to think that we have something to boast of.

Verse 4. Instead of attributing honor to himself and thinking himself to be something by comparing himself to others, a person ought to put his own character to the test by comparing it to the divine law. Then all self-praise and self-deception will disappear. *δε*, "but," in verse 4 introduces a conduct which is the very opposite of that which is spoken of in verse 3. *εργον*, "work," is taken in a collective sense such as "fruit" in 5:22 and is the sum of all the *εργα*, deeds which one performs in his life (cf. Rom. 2:7,15; 1 Pet. 1:17; Rev. 22:12). One's whole life in its objective reality is to be put to the test. For the sake of emphasis *εργον* is placed at the beginning in order to show the very opposite to the simple *δοκειν*,

"seems," (thinks). *δοκιμαζειν* is "to prove, to examine," the constituency of a thing or case, to see if it stands the test or is simply a delusion. *και τοτε*, "and then," namely when he has done this (cf. 1 Cor. 4:5). *καυχημα*, *materia gloriandi*, the material which calls for praise while *καυχησις* is *actus gloriandi*, *gloriatio*, "praise." The article emphasizes that *καυχημα*, the praise-worthy thing, is designated as that which proceeds as the result of examination. It could, of course, happen that the result comes to nothing, that enough failures and weaknesses are discovered to result in humiliation. *εις εαυτον*, *gloriam suam ad semet ipsum restrictam* (Grimm), "his glory-ing restricted to himself." He will keep his praiseworthy deeds to himself and not proclaim it to others. He who judges himself rightly, with strength from God, evaluates himself and his work according to the law of love, and he will not do it as did the Pharisees who stood forth and praised themselves instead of simply putting their own deeds to the test. V. Hofmann explains *εις* as "direction," in direction to oneself, in reference to oneself. The meaning will come out the same. What Paul wants to bring out is that "the critic should examine himself and not first and foremost the others" (Bugge). If we would direct more criticism to ourselves and less to others, we would all of us be better people.

Verse 5 is combined with the foregoing by *γαρ*, "for." That which is to be proved is the precept in verse 4a, and this is proved when each one is responsible for himself. You will merely be asked about **your** burden, but concerning this you will be held responsible. The future *βαστασει*, "shall bear," has in part been considered as the consecutive future, but it is more fitting, with Luther and others, to take it as future in the sense of the coming, the future judgment. Till then each one bears his sin and trespass; for God will hold each one accountable. With reference to this burden one cannot take it or any part of it from another. The foolish virgins could not get oil from the wise on the day of reckoning. *φορτιον* is the diminutive of *φορτος*, though in such a manner that the diminutive belongs only to the form and not to its meaning (cf. Buttman p. 440). The difference between *βαρος*, used in the foregoing for burden, and *φορτιον* is this, that *φορτιον* represents the burden as a thing **carried** and says nothing about its weight or whether it is borne by man or beast. *βαρος*, on the other hand, represents the weight and stress of the burden. We thus understand that this verse is not a contradiction of verse 2. The thought in the two verses

is entirely different.

Verse 6. Here is introduced a change of thought. δε is the metabatic. From here on the apostle shows how in reference to the **temporal one** can demonstrate that he is motivated by the service of love. He begins with specific and proceeds to the general. *κατηχειν* is really *circumsono*, "resound on every side," then "to teach" (*viva voce*, oral). See Luke 1:4; Acts 18:25; 21:21,24; Romans 2:18; 1 Corinthians 14:19. ο *λογος* is the word *κατ' εφοχην*, the Christian doctrine. *κοινωνειν* is "to be or walk in fellowship with one." The word in the NT always has an intransitive meaning (cf. Rom. 12:13; 15:27; Phil. 4:15; 1 Tim. 5:22; Heb. 2:14; 1 Pet. 4:13; 2 John 11). Thus also the composite *συγκοινωνειν*. There it is advisable to use it thus here, equal to *κοινωνον ειναι*. The proper translation would then be: "He who is instructed in the word shall stand in fellowship relations with the one who instructs him." The command is directed to the one being instructed in the word and not to the one who is instructing him, and thus the good things spoken of are the possession of the catechumen and not of the other. Wieseler is wrong when he says that there should be a sharing in all good things which the teacher and the disciple have in common. The good things which the teacher has are the instructions, and the good things of the disciple are the temporal things, since Paul would hardly be asking the disciples to communicate the good things of the spirit to the teacher. The apostle then is saying that the disciple should share all his good things with the teacher who does not have them. With other words the disciple is to have a care for the teacher's temporal needs. ο *κατηχων* refers to the local pastor as well as to the traveling evangelist.

Verse 7. The syntactic connection with the foregoing is missing, but the relation of subject matter is not. The apostle wishes to show how important the Lord considers the observance of the requirement expressed in verse 6. The existing circumstances in the congregations account for the strong words used here. There must have been members who had not been willing to fulfill their obligation to support the ministers of the word with their material means and so were guilty of hindering the progress of God's kingdom. They are now told that God will hold them to account. *μη πλανασθε*, "Be not deceived," do not err (cf. 1 Cor. 6:9; 15:33; James 1:16). *μυκτηριζειν* literally means "to turn up the nose," then to mock. *μυκτηριζεται* is middle, not passive, voice. God does not permit

himself to be mocked. That they will not compensate the servant of the Word, is considered a mockery of God, a mockery which He will not tolerate. *ο γαρ*, "for whatever." This is an evidence that God will not permit Himself to be mocked. As a man sows, so will he harvest. In nature it is so that the crop will be determined by the seed corn. Thus it is also in the spiritual sphere. According to our deed, our conduct, so shall the recompense be which God presents (cf. Prov. 22:8; Hos. 8:7; 10:12,13; 2 Cor. 9:6). The future *θερμσει*, "shall reap," points to the judgment.

Verse 8. *οτι* points to a more specific demonstration of how God gives the recompense. In verse 7 the apostle has presented the recompense by means of the picture of sowing and harvesting. Here he continues the picture of the harvest, but instead of the sowing of the seed he now emphasizes the soil into which the seed is planted. *εις* gives the place; to cast the seed to the flesh, or with flesh as the soil where it is sown. The thought in the picture is this that he who has such a disposition and deals that way, so that the prevailing element is his own flesh as he spends what he has for his own benefit and life style, is seeking to satisfy his own selfish needs. What else can he expect to harvest but *φθορα* "corruption," eternal punishment? *φθορα* is a definite contrast to *ζωη αιωνιος* of the foregoing. To *σαρξ*, "flesh," the apostle adds *εαυτου*, "his" or "his own," to show that the flesh belongs to him in contrast to the next expression—"Spirit," which cannot be considered his own possession in the same sense as "flesh." But thereby the Spirit is designated as the objective Spirit, the Holy Ghost, as Jerome has pointed out. He who has this disposition and deals in such a way that the Spirit of Christ is the determining and driving force will dedicate what he owns and possesses to the service of the Spirit so that His work may prosper. His life is not dedicated to the lusts of the flesh, but to the Spirit. To sow in the Spirit is a thing that only the regenerate can perform. Here there is then no room for the idea that also the unregenerate can perform God-pleasing works; no less is there any support for the doctrine that good deeds are meritorious. *θερμσει*, "shall reap," namely at death or the judgment. That which he reaps is eternal life. When Paul uses the expression "life everlasting," *ζωη αιωνιος*, then he is pointing to the life beyond, the eternal life beyond death and the grave (cf. Rom. 2:7; 5:21; 6:22,23; 1 Tim. 1:16; 6:12; Tit. 1:2; 3:7). When John uses this terminus, he includes also the blessed life in Jesus here upon this

earth (cf. John 3:36; 5:24; 6:47; 17:3; 1 John 5:12,13). Paul here calls the blessed life simply "life," *ζωη*, besides which he also presupposes the life beyond.

Verse 9 contains a communicative admonition not to become tired of doing good. This verse is closely connected to verse 8 since *το καλον ποιειν*, "to do good," is another expression for *σπειρειν εις το πνευμα*, "to sow to the Spirit." This picture is here continued with *θερισομεν*, "we shall reap." A blessed harvest awaits him who dedicates what he has so that the Spirit's work may be done. But the harvest lies in the future; therefore the apostle speaks of it as an encouragement to endure. He who endures shall not be disappointed. *το καλον* is the good work in general. The word *ενκακειν* is written in the manuscripts in a three fold manner: *ενκακειν*, *εγκακειν*, and *εκκακειν*. Outside of the NT and the church fathers only *εγκακειν* is found. *καιρω ιδιω*, "in its time," is God's appointed time for the harvest, the last day. Then the harvest will take place, provided that the one concerned does not become weary in well-doing. *εκλυειν* means literally "to loose" or "set free," but is often used also with the meaning "to be faint, exhausted," whether it be in body or soul. *μη εκλυομενοι*, "if we do not faint," an emphatic repetition of the thought expressed in *μη ενκακωμεν*.

Verse 10. Here the apostle, *αρα ουν*, draws the conclusion from the foregoing that we should always do good as we have the opportunity. Now since the regeneration is so certain, therefore the harvest will take place at the appointed time. *αρα ουν* is an intensified *αρα*. *καιρος* is *opportunum tempus*, "the befitting time," namely to do good. When we have the opportunity to do so, we are to do good. We should not consult our own desire, but act according to the opportunity. Here we have "the good thing," *το αγαθον*, above the *το καλον*. The thought is basically the same, but *καλος* points specifically to that which is good in itself, while *αγαθος* holds forth the good which may be of service to another. In *αγαθος* lies also the concept of that which is useful, and the apostle purposely used this word in which he admonishes to do good to all men. The article *το* in connection with *καλον* and *αγαθον* is generic. *οικειος* is properly the one who belongs to the household, family. Besides, the word in a broader sense is also used to designate one who is a friend, or a thing or someone who belongs. For example, *οικειος, της φιλοφρονης, ολιγαρχιας, τυγαυιδος*, etc. The household of faith designates those who are fellow believers, those who are in the fellowship of faith with us; these then,

*μαλιστα*, are to be the first and closest objects for our Christian goodness. Luther says: "Paul here calls the believers by a new name, those of the household of faith, which embraces first and foremost the preachers and then also all the other believing hearers." We shall therefore always bear in mind that the strongest bond ties us to those who are of the same faith as ours. As Olshausen remarks, this does not place any limit to the practice of love, but rather a limitation in its exercise because of inadequate means.

### **The conclusion of the letter (11-18)**

Paul first of all tells that the epistle was written by himself. The apostle usually made use of a secretary. In this instance he did not, and from this the readers should understand the close relationship he had to them. By writing the epistle with his own hand, the apostle would show what a personal attachment existed between them, and the letter was also to show how he missed being in their presence. At this point Paul returns to the short and sharp words with which he started the epistle in 1:6ff., namely with reference to the destructive work of the false teachers. He now characterizes the false teachers as lovers of self, as preachers of the circumcision who avoided persecution. Opposed to them he places his own person and the power of the cross of Christ which has made him into a new man. In verses 14-15 he pronounces a blessing upon those who walk with him in the truth. As one who has been persecuted to the blood for Christ's sake he begs them not to trouble him any more. He closes with the earnest prayer that the grace of Jesus Christ might be with the spirit of the readers.

---

## BOOK REVIEWS

***CATHOLIC, LUTHERAN, PROTESTANT: A Doctrinal Comparison of Three Christian Confessions,***  
by Gregory L. Jackson, Ph.D. St. Louis: Martin Chemnitz Press, 1993.

If you liked Dr. Jackson's previous book, *LIBERALISM: ITS CAUSE AND CURE*, you will also appreciate his current selection. *CATHOLIC, LUTHERAN, PROTESTANT* has been extensively promoted through CHRISTIAN NEWS. It appears to have been self published under the banner of "Martin Chemnitz Press." It is too bad this book doesn't have a wider distribution through a publishing house. It is excellent! Dr. Jackson's book was originally intended to be used in a congregational class setting geared for members who were married to, or who were going to be married to, Roman Catholics. In his introduction he writes, "The purpose of *CATHOLIC, LUTHERAN, PROTESTANT* is to teach the main differences between Roman Catholicism and Lutheranism . . ." The author is especially suited for such an endeavor because he studied theology and earned his Ph.D. at the University of Notre Dame.

The book is divided into three parts: Part One—Areas of Agreement; Part Two—Partial Agreement; and Part Three—Complete Disagreement. Part One deals with those doctrines that are agreed upon by Roman Catholics, Lutherans and Protestants. He lists here "The Scriptures, the Trinity, the Two Natures of Christ, Natural Law." Part Two speaks of that area in which there is partial agreement between Roman Catholics and Lutherans, particularly when it comes to the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. At the end of Part Two Dr. Jackson has an excellent summary and comparison of how Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and Protestants all view the Means of Grace. Part Three is by far the most interesting, since he considers those areas of theology where there is complete disagreement between these three groups of Christian churches. He deals with Justification by Faith; Purgatory; Infallibility, Primacy and Authority of the Pope; and Doctrines concerning the Virgin Mary. He ends with a chapter entitled, "Was Luther Right? Is the Papacy the AntiChrist?"

The book is filled with primary source material. It is all extensively catalogued. Not only should this volume be read and studied by our seminarians in connection with their Comparative Symbolics studies, but it should be on the shelf of each of our pastors. It would be especially helpful to those who find themselves ministering in strongly Roman Catholic communities.

All in all, the book is objective and well-written. There are many sections that we could quote, but let three suffice. Dr. Jackson writes:

Lutherans cannot afford to rest upon their denominational affiliation and say, "O God, we thank you that we are not like these." The time of apostasy has struck at all of Christianity. So many Christian leaders have turned away from their own heritage that the gravitational pull of their apostasy threatens us all. We are tempted to say, "At least we don't . . ." only to find ourselves doing and saying the same things a few years later, comforted by our relative faithfulness. But God's Word does not admonish us to be somewhat better than apostates. We have only one standard, the pure Word of God. We must measure our doctrine and practice against that rather than against the standing of another denomination. (254)

Under the subheading, "A Final Word—the Gospel," he writes:

The purpose of this book has been to provide a way for couples to understand, study and discuss three distinctive Christian confessions. Pastors, seminarians and college students may also benefit from doctrinal comparisons and a study of the sources, especially the Scriptures. But this is not intended to be an intellectual exercise. Instead, the research was done in order to make clear the blessings and benefits of Christ's atoning death on the cross. (254)

The one statement that this reviewer found the most interesting was at the end of the introduction:

Today, too many Lutheran leaders identify with the Protestants who broke with Luther over the sacraments and the efficacy of the Word. Lutheranism is properly described as a conservative Reformation of Catholicism and not as another Protestant denomination. Heirs of the Swiss Reformation assert that Lutherans are 'too Catholic' to be considered Protestant. May it ever be so.

The book is well worth the price, \$13.95. Send for a copy from the CLC Book House, 501 Grover Road, Eau Claire, WI 54701-7199.

- Stephen C. F. Kurtzahn

-----

***Pastors (Off the Record),*** by Stefan Ulstein. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1993.

What we have here is the result of off-the-record conversations with a variety of pastors from various denominations. The sub-heading is “Straight Talk about Life in the Ministry.” The author or interviewer says in his introduction: “I allowed the pastors to talk off the record because I wanted them to feel free to speak their hearts. ... I chose to keep the interviews anonymous and the locations and denominations vague, so that readers could concentrate on the stories rather than the storytellers” (p. 13).

If these pastors are typical (and I suppose they are), the situation in our American church life today is similar to what the evangelist Mark described in these words: “They were like sheep not having a shepherd” (Mark 6:34), or to what Jesus Himself said: “They are blind leaders of the blind” (Matt. 15:14). With only a few exceptions the pastors interviewed in this book do not have the basic qualifications for leadership in Christ’s Church. Most importantly, they lack that characteristic presented by Paul to Titus as a necessity: “holding fast the faithful word” (Tit. 1:9). Many of these pastors seem to hold the view that they are social workers rather than messengers of the Almighty God and proclaimers of the Good News of Christ.

The value of this book lies in its helping us to understand what pastors are thinking and feeling in connection with their present-day ministries. Problems abound in every direction. Problems with the members. Problems in their families. Problems with their denominational superiors. Problems with themselves and, I suppose, with God as well. To be a truly faithful pastor of Christ is as difficult today as it ever was.

We sympathize with the pastor interviewed in chapter 19, who says: “I’m the only pastor in this community who believes that homosexuality is a sin rather than an alternate lifestyle.” What a sad commentary on the state of Christianity in this country! This same pastor says: “If you say the Word errs, you are saying God errs. I seem to be the only one in this community who will say that.”

This pastor is one of the few pastors interviewed in this book who seems to know what being a pastor is all about. “Pastors are supposed to be shepherds and spiritual leaders of the flock. Too many people profess Christ but don’t know anything about the absolutes that have stood for eighteen hundred years. ... When we teach truth we glorify Christ. ... Christ went looking for the sheep that was missing. So often you hear people say, ‘I’ve been gone for two months and nobody’s called.’ A shepherd has to know his sheep.”

May God in His grace continue to grant us truly faithful, orthodox, pious, Christ-centered pastors! This book shows that such pastors are rare.

***Exit Interviews*, by William D. Hendricks. Chicago: Moody Press, 1993.**

In a sense this book is a companion volume to the book reviewed above. Here, however, we have ordinary church members rather than ordinary pastors being interviewed, and the main point of these interviews is to find out why these people have dropped out or fallen away from the churches they once attended. The subtitle sums it up: “Revealing Stories of Why People Are Leaving the Church.”

The first chapter explains what is happening so often in our church life and why the total membership and influence of the church is not increasing even though so many efforts are being made to attract the unchurched. Simply stated, the problem is that as many (or more) are going out the back door of the church as are coming in the front door. Our own church body has experienced this phenomenon. New people are coming into the church all the time, but yet the total stays about the same, because so many are dropping out.

A certain Dr. John Savage has studied this problem of “dropouts” for over 17 years. His findings are quoted: “100 percent of the inactive members he interviewed said that no one had ever come to visit them. ... One person told him, ‘I have not been active in my church for ten years, and no one has ever asked me why.’”

Our author sees this neglect as a violation of New Testament teaching, and we agree. It is strange, is it not? “We have churches and denominations today literally doing whatever it takes to attract ‘unchurched’ people to the front door of the faith. Meanwhile, people who have been in the program for years can slip out the back for a variety of reasons and go six or eight weeks | or even ten years | without so much as a phone call or a visit. . . . We owe it to the disillusioned member to listen. To really listen.”

This book then allows us to listen to Diane, Elaine, Robert, Jennifer, Vince, John, Daniel, and Tom, etc., to find out from them why they dropped out. In many cases the interviews reveal, or seem to reveal, that the person who dropped out had never really been a Christian at all. What passes for Christianity in our church world today is so often very shallow and superficial: a momentary feeling or emotion, a quick decision for selfish reasons or to please someone else. Most churches, it seems, totally neglect careful or orderly catechesis or thorough instruction in the basic teachings of the Christian faith. Since “fast food” is so popular today, I suppose people want “fast religion” too. The churches are apparently so eager for members that they make it easy for anyone to join the group and be accepted as a full member.

Others who have dropped out of churches have legitimate reasons for doing so. Their churches are promoters and defenders of false teaching or ungodly practices or plain and simple worldliness, and they want to get out. Many times



these dropouts cannot find what they want or need. One would like to have the names and addresses of some of these people so as to be able to direct them to a faithful Christian pastor. We are reminded of how foolish Billy Graham and other like-minded evangelists are for turning over their “converts” to false-teaching churches, even to the church of the Antichrist. The crowds are big, but the cost to insure these crowds is far too high. Evangelism in cooperation with false-teaching churches is not and never will be God’s way of spreading His gospel.

This book is sad. The devil is as evil as ever, and he is working hard to turn people away from Christ. May we pray all the more fervently: “Hallowed by Thy name! Thy kingdom come! Thy will be done!”

-----

***Handbook of Evangelical Theologians*, edited by Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1993.**

This book of 465 pages contains biographical sketches of 33 systematic theologians as well as brief summaries of their theological emphases. The 33 theologians are presented in chronological order from Augustus H. Strong (1836-1921) to Alister E. Mc Grath (1953- ). It seems that all of them have written textbooks or longer treatises on systematic theology or dogmatics.

Of special interest to us is the fact that three Lutheran theologians are included: Francis Pieper (1852-1931), Helmut Thielicke (1908-1986), and Robert D. Preus (1924- ). Each chapter is written by a different author, an author in basic agreement with the theologian about whose life and works he is writing. Thus the biography of Francis Pieper was written by David P. Scaer (Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne, Indiana); the biography of Helmut Thielicke was written by C. George Fry (Lutheran College of Health Professions, Fort Wayne, Indiana); and the biography of Robert D. Preus was written by his colleague at Concordia Seminary in Fort Wayne, Kurt Marquart.

Sad to say, most of these theologians turn out to be false teachers in one way or another. Very few of them have taken a strong stand on the inspiration and inerrancy of Holy Scripture. There are exceptions, of course, like Francis Pieper and Robert Preus among the Lutherans, and B. B. Warfield, J. Gresham Machen, and J. I. Packer among the Reformed. Some of them are or have been energetic proponents of dispensational, pre-millennialistic false dreams, such as Lewis Sperry Chafer, W. H. Griffith Thomas, John F. Walvoord, and Charles C. Ryrie, all of them associated with Dallas Theological Seminary. J. Rodman Williams is presented as the systematic theologian of the charismatic movement. There are some conservative Calvinist theologians represented here also, such as Louis Berkhof, G. C. Berkouwer, and Anthony Hoekema. Some of the theologians have moved from conservatism to liberalism, such as Bernard Ramm and Clark H. Pinnock, whereas others seem to be moving from liberalism to conservatism, such as Donald G. Bloesch and Thomas Oden.

Francis Pieper, of course, is the pre-eminent systematic theologian of the Lutheran Synodical Conference. We still use his three-volume *Christian Dogmatics* (in English translation) as our basic dogmatics textbook in the seminary. Its weakness is that its polemics are directed against the false teachers of a former age. It is particularly Friedrich Schleiermacher and the Erlangen School of Lutheran theologians influenced by Schleiermacher against whom Pieper is writing. He had nothing to say about Karl Barth and the neo-orthodox theologians who were already beginning their work while Pieper was still alive. Nor does he have much to say on the subject of infant baptism, apparently because that was not in contention at that time.

The strength of Pieper is his emphasis on justification by grace, conversion as a work of the Holy Spirit alone, and the Holy Scriptures as the only source for theology. Pieper defended at great length the Christology of the Lutheran confessions over against Calvinism. Another emphasis of his is the working of the Holy Spirit through the means of grace.

In order to explain Pieper’s strong stand against unionism or cooperation with false teachers, Scaer informs us that Pieper’s home province in Germany was Pomerania, one of the territories where the ruler “forced an administrative union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches” (p. 41). “Liturgies compromising the Lutheran understanding of the Lord’s Supper were distributed by the king.” Many Lutherans who wanted to be loyal to their own confession emigrated to America or Australia. Francis Pieper came to America in 1870, together with his widowed mother and three young brothers, among whom was August Pieper, theological leader in the Wisconsin Synod for many years.

Scaer sums up Pieper’s opposition to unionism by saying: “Pieper charges Christians to avoid those churches which do not teach the truth and to join those which do. Receiving communion and serving as baptismal sponsors at the former are disallowed” (p. 48). This position was unpopular in his day and even more unpopular in our ecumenical age. Nevertheless, Pieper drew his warnings from Scripture, and therefore they are still as applicable today as they were in Pomerania in Pieper’s youth and in America in his manhood.

Of great interest to us in this connection is the recent English translation and publication of a 1924 conference essay by F. Pieper on unionism (*The Faithful Word*, Spring 1993, pp. 5-45). In this essay F. Pieper contends not only against altar fellowship with errorists but against prayer fellowship as well. He says, for example, with reference to 2 John 10-11: "This passage forbids unionism, church fellowship with someone whom we recognize as a false teacher. With such we must not have prayer fellowship or altar fellowship, because then, as the apostle says, we become partakers with their evil deeds" (p. 9). It is highly unfortunate that the church body of which Francis Pieper was a member, the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod (LC-MS), has not followed its teacher in his warnings against unionism and in particular has disavowed his warnings against prayer fellowship with errorists.

The other theologian of the Missouri Synod included in this volume is Robert D. Preus, born in St. Paul, Minnesota, when his father, Jacob (Jake) A. O. Preus, was the governor of the state. After leaving the governor's office, Jake moved to Chicago, where he co-founded Lutheran Brotherhood, the insurance company. Robert Preus' older brother is J. A. O. (Jack) Preus, former president of the Missouri Synod.

Like his older brother Jack, Robert left the liberal Lutheran synod of his youth to join the confessional Evangelical Lutheran Synod (ELS). In fact, Robert in 1947 was the very first graduate of Bethany Lutheran Seminary, the ELS seminary in Mankato, Minnesota. In the opinion of many persons now in our church body, these were the glory years of the ELS, when they were under the influence of such stalwart leaders as S. C. Ylvisaker and Norman Madson, Sr. The Preus brothers proposed that the ELS break its ties with the LC-MS. The ELS did resolve to suspend fellowship with the LC-MS in 1955 but was not consistent in carrying out this suspension in its practice.

But what was really inconsistent was the fact that both Robert and Jack Preus accepted calls into the LC-MS, even though they had labeled that church body as heterodox and there was no new evidence to indicate that that label was wrong. At this point in his account Kurt Marquart quotes the line of Ralph Waldo Emerson: "A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds." As true as this line may be in some circumstances, it does not seem to fit the action of the Preus brothers. Marquart says: "The Preus brothers had changed not their theological principles, but their assessment of the Missouri Synod. ... Jack and Robert Preus, upon better acquaintance with the Missouri Synod, decided that the situation there was not hopeless, and that their battle for evangelical, confessional orthodoxy might better be waged in the much larger Missouri Synod" (p. 355).

Whether a situation is hopeless or not is not for us to say. In any case we should be obedient to the Lord's warning to avoid those causing divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine we have learned from Him. The Preus brothers were right in their original assessment of the Missouri Synod, and it is really a tragedy that they joined it instead of being leaders in a truly confessional and consistent church body. In spite of all the valiant efforts of the Preus brothers in behalf of the truth, the LC-MS remains a heterodox church body today, deeply divided, increasingly unionistic, and seemingly on the verge of departing even further from the sound confession of F. Pieper and the *Brief Statement* of 1932.

Yet we do not deny that we can truly profit from the doctrinal studies on justification and inerrancy produced by Robert Preus. He is a gift of God to Christ's Church, and all things are ours, as Paul teaches in 1 Corinthians 3:21-23. We make very much use in our seminary of his studies of the Lutheran dogmaticians. We appreciate especially his clear presentations of universal justification and the election of grace. But we cannot and do not approve of his continued membership in the unionistic Missouri Synod. We are grateful to our God for letting Robert Preus use his abilities for the good of His Church in spite of his having taken a wrong turn back in the 1950s. It would be good if he could use his retirement years to complete the projected volumes of *Confessional Lutheran Dogmatics*, even as his brother Jack has used his retirement years to translate the writings of Martin Chemnitz from Latin to English.

To round out this review, we make mention of the other theologians whose lives and works are presented in this volume. The ones we have not yet mentioned include, in chronological order, James Orr, Edgar Young Mullins, H. Orton Wiley, Henry C. Thiessen, Cornelius Van Til, John Murray, Gordon H. Clark, Charles W. Carter, Francis Schaeffer, Carl F. H. Henry, Edward John Carnell, John R. W. Stott, and Millard J. Erickson. A volume like this is certainly helpful in getting us to understand the background and doctrinal position of these influential theological leaders. We shall make use of it in our seminary work.

---

- David Lau