

4-1-1943

To What Extent May and Must Action be Taken in the Case of Mixed Marriages?

Ronald W. Goetsch
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm>



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Goetsch, Ronald W. (1943) "To What Extent May and Must Action be Taken in the Case of Mixed Marriages?," *Concordia Theological Monthly*: Vol. 14 , Article 24.
Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol14/iss1/24>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

name is not the mere designation, a sense which would give the baptismal formula merely the force of a charm. The *name*, as in the Lord's Prayer (Hallowed be Thy name), is the expression of the sum total of the Divine Being; not His designation as God or Lord, but the formula in which all His attributes and characteristics are summed up. It is equivalent to His person. The finite mind can deal with Him only through His name; but His name is of no avail detached from His nature. When one is baptized into the name of the Trinity, he professes to acknowledge and appropriate God in all that He is and in all that He does for man. He recognizes and depends upon God the Father as his Creator and Preserver; receives Jesus Christ as his only Mediator and Redeemer, and pattern of life; and confesses the Holy Spirit as his Sanctifier and Comforter."

Also the synodical *Catechism* (Schwan), Question 277, offers this explanation of baptizing in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, "It is receiving into communion with the Triune God by Baptism according to Christ's command."

Let us, then, in teaching our children not lightly pass over these important words, explaining them to mean merely that in Baptism water is applied at the command of the Triune God. But let us convey to them, as far as they are able to grasp it, the Gospel meaning of these words. Let us frequently remind also our adult congregations of this blessed truth that by being baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost we have in early infancy personally and individually entered into so close a union and communion with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit as to become God's own and partakers of all His blessings, and that this fellowship, if deeply appreciated by us, will be reflected in our lives, Rom. 6:1-14. Baptism is of importance not only to the infant that is being baptized, but also to the adult Christian that has been baptized, and it should be a source of comfort and strength to him all the days of his life.

E. W. A. KOEHLER

To What Extent May and Must Action be Taken in the Case of Mixed Marriages?

(A Conference Paper)

I

A mixed marriage is sometimes thought of as the marriage between a believer and an unbeliever. But that is not the only meaning attaching to the term. Quite often it designates the marriage of persons of different faiths or religions.

II

Mixed marriages have brought both bane and blessing, the bane outweighing the blessing, and the blessing never being unalloyed. To deny that mixed marriages have at times resulted in blessing, *e. g.*, in the conversion of the other party to the true faith or in the happiness of both parties concerned, is to be too dogmatic. It is simply a denial of the facts. Yet these cases are, comparatively speaking, "few and far between." The bane of mixed marriages continues to outweigh the blessing. Often a mixed marriage results in the loss of the true faith for the one party involved, again in indifference to religion by either or both of the parties, and very often in a total disregard of all religion. In other words, mixed marriages are dangerous. For that reason Scripture warns against them.

1

These warnings are contained in such records as tell us of the baneful results of mixed marriages. In Gen. 6:2 we read, "The sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose." The sons of God were the descendants of Seth and represented the children of faith. The daughters of men were Cain's descendants and represented the children of unbelief. For the one to marry the other had become common practice. But from these mixed marriages so great a corruption of the human race resulted that the Flood was sent to cleanse the world.

Warned perchance by that disaster, the Patriarchs opposed mixed marriages. Abraham made his servant Eliezer swear that he would not take a wife for Isaac, his son, "of the daughters of the Canaanites," among whom he was dwelling, but from among Abraham's own people. Isaac in turn laid the same command on his son Jacob, saying, "Thou shalt not take a wife of the daughters of Canaan. Arise, go to Padanaram, to the house of Bethuel, thy mother's father; and take thee a wife from thence of the daughters of Laban, thy mother's brother." (Gen. 28:1, 2.)

Again, we read in the third chapter of the Book of Judges, "And the children of Israel dwelt among the Canaanites, Hittites, and Amorites, the Perizzites, and Hivites, and Jebusites; and they took their daughters to be their wives and gave their daughters to their sons and served their gods. And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord and forgot the Lord, their God, and served Baalim and the groves." Here is one of the greatest dangers of mixed marriages: The result of such marriages often "is that the orthodox party falls away from the true religion."

Solomon, though he was noted for his wisdom, showed a lack of sound judgment and made the same grievous mistake that some

of his forebears had made in the days of the Judges. "King Solomon loved many strange women, together with the daughter of Pharaoh, women of the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians, and Hittites; of the nations concerning which the Lord said unto the children of Israel, Ye shall not go in to them, neither shall they come in unto you; for surely they will turn away your heart after their gods; Solomon clave unto these in love. And he had seven hundred wives, princesses, and three hundred concubines; and his wives turned away his heart. For it came to pass, when Solomon was old, that his wives turned away his heart after other gods; and his heart was not perfect with the Lord, his God, as was the heart of David, his father. For Solomon went after Ashtoreth, the goddess of the Zidonians, and after Milcol, the abomination of the Ammonites. And Solomon did evil in the sight of the Lord and went not fully after the Lord, as did David his father. Then did Solomon build an high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, in the hill that is before Jerusalem, and for Molech, the abomination of the children of Ammon. And likewise did he for all his strange wives, which burnt incense and sacrifices unto their gods. And the Lord was angry with Solomon, because his heart was turned from the Lord God of Israel, etc." (1 Kings 11:1-9.)

Such are some of the warnings of Scripture against mixed marriages.

2

These warnings become intensified when in the theocratic state of Israel God actually and distinctly forbade mixed marriages.

One of the stipulations of the covenant entered into by God and the people of Israel at Mount Sinai was this: "Thou shalt worship no other god; for the Lord, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God; lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land and they go a whoring after their gods and do sacrifice unto their gods and one call thee and thou eat of his sacrifice; and thou take of their daughters unto thy sons and their daughters go a whoring after their gods and make thy sons go a whoring after their gods." (Ex. 34:14-16.)

This command of the Lord Moses reiterated Deut. 7:1-4. "When the Lord thy God shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it and hath cast out many nations before thee, the Hittites and the Gergashites, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, seven nations greater and mightier than thou; and when the Lord thy God shall deliver them before thee, thou shalt smite them and utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them: *neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto*

thy son. For they will turn away thy son from following Me, that they may serve other gods; so will the anger of the Lord be kindled against you and destroy thee suddenly."

So important did the first leaders of Israel deem this command of the Lord that Joshua, even in his old age, bound it upon the consciences of his people. "Take good heed therefore unto yourselves that ye love the Lord your God. Else if ye do in any wise go back and cleave unto the remnant of these nations, even these that remain among you, and *shall make marriages with them*, and go in unto them, and they to you: know for a certainty that the Lord your God will no more drive out any of these nations from before you; but they shall be snares and traps unto you, and scourges in your sides, and thorns in your eyes, until ye perish from off this good land which the Lord your God hath given you." (Josh. 23:11-13.)

It is this distinct command of the Lord that Solomon transgressed to his own hurt. "Ye shall not go in to them, neither shall they come in unto you; for surely they will turn away your heart after their gods." (1 Kings 11:2.)

Even after the return of the children of Israel from the Babylonian Captivity this command was not abrogated. "Give not your daughters unto their sons," said Ezra, "neither take their daughters unto your sons." (Ezra 9:12.) And with bitter vehemence does Nehemiah inform us: "In those days also saw I Jews that had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab; and their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod and could not speak in the Jews' language, but according to the language of each people. And I contended with them, and cursed them, and smote certain of them, and plucked off their hair, and made them swear by God, saying, Ye shall not give your daughters unto their sons, nor take their daughters unto your sons, or for yourselves. Did not Solomon, King of Israel, sin by these things? yet among many nations was there no king like him, who was beloved of his God, and God made him king over all Israel; nevertheless even him did outlandish women cause to sin. Shall we, then, hearken unto you to do all this great evil, to transgress against our God in marrying strange wives?" (Neh. 13:23-27.) Here was patriotic fervor coupled with religious fervor, and both were directed against a common evil that was inimical to both Church and State, which were united in a theocratic form of government.

3

In fairness we would, in passing, point to mixed marriages recorded in the Bible which were allowed and which apparently resulted in blessing. No voice was raised against the marriage of Joseph. "And Pharaoh called Joseph's name Zaphnath-paaneah;

and he gave him to wife Asenath, the daughter of Potipherah, priest of On." (Gen. 41:45.) The two sons born of this union, Ephraim and Manasseh, were included in the twelve tribes of Israel.

Then there is the marriage of Moses and Zipporah, a daughter of the priest of Midian (Ex. 2:21), who at first apparently was unacquainted with the religion of Israel and only later became a convert, for she showed disgust at the rite of circumcision. (Ex. 4:24-26.)

Then, again, we have the record of Ruth, the Moabitess. Of Elimelech's sons we are told, "They took them wives of the women of Moab; the name of the one was Orpah, and the name of the other Ruth." (Ruth 1:4.) Ruth evidently adopted the religion of Israel. Concerning Orpah we cannot make this statement.

III

To resume the topic, we have seen that the voice of Scripture is raised in warning against mixed marriages. Let the voices of theologians and other leaders be heard next.

1

Very pointedly Luther writes in his "Vorrede ueber des D. Urban Rhegius Erklarung der Weissagungen des Alten Testaments von Christo": "Sodann gibt es nichts Lieblicheres, als wenn in der Ehe Mann und Weib im Glauben einerlei Sinnes sind und Gott einmuetig anrufen. Es ist eine gegenseitige grosse Huelfe, wenn der Glaube des einen fuer den andern besorgt ist und sich fuer ihn bei Gott bemueht. Ja, es soll die Ehe eine solche Gemeinschaft sein, von der Christus sagt (Matth. 18:20): 'Wo zwei versammelt sind in meinem Namen, da bin ich mitten unter ihnen.' Eheleute sollen zusammen in rechtem Glauben Gott anrufen, sich miteinander vom Evangelio unterreden, ihre Kinder das Evangelium lehren." (St. L., XIV:147.)

2

Walther in his *Pastorale*, quoting the theological faculty of Leipzig, writes: "Die Leipziger theologische Facultaet gab im Jahre 1620 folgendes Votum ab: 'Auf die Frage, ob eine lutherische Person sich mit einer halsstarrigen calvinischen Person, die sich nicht weissen lassen will, in Ehestand begeben, von den Predigern getraut und eingesegnet werden koenne? — erachten wir zu antworten sein, dass zwar keineswegs zu rathen, dass eine lutherische Person dergestalt sich in den Ehestand einlasse, sintemal die *matrimonia* mit Personen, so falscher Lehre und Religion zugethan, nie wohl zu gerathen pflegen, sondern viel Unheils mit sich bringen, wie die Exempel in Gottes Wort und sonderlich in Befreundung des Hauses Josaphat mit dem Hause Ahab 2 Chron. 18—22 und in taeglicher Erfahrung vor Augen,' etc. (*Pastorale*, p. 229.)

3

Fritz in his *Pastoral Theology* writes, p. 172, "Mixed marriages are not in accordance with the intimate and close relation that ought to exist between husband and wife; they also very much interfere with such things as family devotion and the Christian training of children. If an orthodox person enters upon such a mixed marriage, it might seem that he is not taking his orthodox religion seriously."

4

Writing on "The Unequal Yoke of Faith and Unbelief" in *For Better Not for Worse*, W. A. Maier has this to say (p. 261 f.): "We cannot estimate the sacrifice of the resources of happiness in that house which is divided against itself through unbelief. There can be no permanent harmony and complete understanding where an unchurched partner by active or passive opposition continually resists the expression of Christian faith and where the specter of separation in eternity looms up in all its ghastliness. In the day of trouble, when the lowering clouds of sorrow enshroud the home with their gray, cold forebodings, there is need for the complete dedication to the one Lord who 'doeth all things well' and for the mutual strengthening of spiritual encouragement. To be joined in marriage with an unbeliever is an acid test of one's Christianity; and that this test is usually too strong is shown by the fact that the believing husband or wife is frequently estranged from the Church, imperceptibly at first, but openly at last. Thrift, good taste, pleasing personality, physical attractiveness, sense of humor, sympathy, neatness, patience, success, and the long catalog of other demands upon which young people frequently insist are all secondary when compared with the fundamental fact that without Christ, acknowledged by both husband and wife, there can be little definite assurance of lasting happiness. When marriage has only a physical foundation; when it is based merely on mental similarity and attraction; when it entirely ignores spiritual compatibility, it overlooks the one divine element which makes for family unification rather than divisiveness. How much more helpful and hopeful is a marriage dominated by a common faith, communion of worship, and spiritual co-operation, through which joy and sorrow alike can be met and shared together! What an inestimably more reassuring promise of mutual understanding and of reciprocal encouragement there is in the pledge (Ruth 1:16) 'Thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God!' Maier concedes, yet maintains: "There are always exceptional cases, it has been conceded, in which an unbelieving or disinterested husband has been brought to Christ through the intercession of a Christian wife. But such isolated instances do not disprove the general truth that for the sacred

union of marriage a Christian should not be bound together with an unbeliever." (P. 263.)

Writing on "Interdenominational Marriages," W. A. Maier says (p. 268): "We know marriages of this kind in which harmony and contentment seem to prevail, but they are not frequent. Below the serenity of the surface there is often a resignation to a sense of hopelessness which bravely resolves to make the best of a disheartening situation.

"For ten years, from 1926 to 1936, H. A. Dittmar, teacher at Mount Calvary Lutheran School, St. Louis, Mo., carefully observed the church attendance of children who came from homes in which both parents are affiliated with the same church and homes in which one parent or no parent is a church member. He finds in the case of 508 children and in a total of more than 500 church services that the average attendance for children with two Lutheran parents is 77.12 per cent. In families with only one parent a Lutheran the average is 62.31 per cent, and in homes where neither parent is a member of the Church the average drops to 56.8 per cent."

"The fact that most divorces involving members of the Lutheran Church occurred in mixed marriages should be an unmistakable warning."

5

A pertinent quotation of F. Niedner we find in *The Concordia Pulpit*, Vol. 7, p. 253: "Another thing that will keep your married life happy is this, that you are both of the same faith. This is very important. There is a great danger in mixed marriages. Now, I know that in exceptional cases there are mixed marriages that turn out to be happy marriages. But I want to insist that there is danger in mixed marriages. If both parties want to be absolutely loyal and true to their own faith and their own Church in every way, there is bound to be conflict. If the church services are held at different times, the family life or social arrangements are likely to be disturbed, and this will often cause argument and conflict. If both parents wish to contribute liberally to their Church, dissatisfaction may creep in, and if both parties want to rear the children in their own faith, as a loyal church member should, then altercation and dissension cannot be avoided. If each party wants to be absolutely true and loyal to his own Church, there will be trouble. Of course, it is possible to keep clear of any conflict by a compromise in these things, if each one gives up something for the other. But right here is the danger I am speaking of. A true and loyal member of his Church cannot compromise. Loyalty knows no compromise."

6

Another voice is that of Maclaren: "If a young Christian man or woman enter into marriage with one who is not a Christian, it

is a great deal more probable that, in the end, there will be two unbelievers than that there will be two Christians." (*Concordia Pulpit*, Vol. 7, p. 252.)

7

In his "Ten Commandments on Marriage," as published in the *Milwaukee Journal* of Sunday, June 23, 1940, Rev. Edwin O. Kennedy, pastor of Christ Presbyterian Church of Madison, lists as his fifth commandment: "Avoid marrying a mate with a radically different background of race or religion"; and as his tenth: "Go to church together."

8

And from out the camp of the Roman Catholic Church comes the voice of one Rev. Anthony L. Ostheimer, bearing the *Nihil Obstat* of Joseph A. M. Quigley, Censor Librorum, and the *Imprimatur* of D. Card. Dougherty, Archbishop of Philadelphia. Ostheimer wrote *Instructions for Non-Catholics Before Marriage*. In it he writes:

"The great majority of mixed marriages prove unhappy to the contracting parties and to the children. As a result of disagreements, arising especially from difference in religious beliefs, many of these mixed marriages end in divorce or at least in separation from bed and board. (P. vii.)

"In the very beginning it must be said that such a marriage, which is called a mixed marriage, is not an ideal marriage, because it divides a home on the most important thing in life: religion and the means of salvation; it creates 'a house divided against itself'; it paves the way for further difficulties. (Pp. 7, 8.)

"The Catholic Church is opposed to marriages in which husband and wife are not of the same faith, in order to promote both the domestic peace and the eternal salvation of her children. There will always be more than enough elements of dissension asserting themselves and threatening the family unity and peace, without husband and wife being divided on the very important and far-reaching matter of religion. Two who share the same joys and sorrows, hearts that beat in unison to the same memories and hopes, lives merged into one for better or worse, richer or poorer, in sickness and in health, even unto death, should not be divided when they approach their common God, in adoration, in petition in the hour of need, and in grateful thanksgiving for blessings enjoyed in common. In the guiding faith, sustaining hope, and transforming charity of religion, with its pious practices to encourage, and its divine sacraments to sanctify, man and wife should still be one, and so bequeath to their children, as their richest legacy, the heirloom of their common faith. (Pp. 7, 8.)

"Experience, too, has shown that it is always best to have

unity of religion in every family, to have husband and wife profess the same faith. For that reason it is best to have a Catholic marry a Catholic, a Lutheran marry a Lutheran, an Episcopalian marry an Episcopalian, a Jew marry a Jew. It is true that non-Catholics, for the most part [?], give very little thought to religion, and so for them it matters little what religion they profess. The fact cannot be denied, however, that when both husband and wife profess the same faith, the chances that their marriage will be a happy one are greatly increased.

"What, for instance, must children think of parents whose beliefs and religious practices are in conflict? They will reason in this manner: 'If father and mother cannot agree on religion, why should I bother about it at all?' Indifference to religion, to be followed perhaps by a total disregard of religion, will often be the result. Honestly believing that she is the Church which Christ founded and that her doctrine is Christ's doctrine, the Catholic Church must require the observance 'of all things . . . commanded,' and so [sic!] she forbids her children to marry non-Catholics. It is only for some very good reason that she will make an exception to her rule, and even then she merely tolerates the mixed marriage." (Pp. 9, 10.)

Dr. William Stang, an eminent Catholic authority, writes: "But despite these conditions, signed and solemnly sworn to" (referring to promises which we shall mention later), "whole generations are lost. Many an upright Protestant refuses to sign the above conditions, and I respect him for his refusal. Many more who sign them have no intention of obligating themselves by them. What troubles and afflictions follow such marriages God alone could tell. As fellow citizens we must do all in our power to persuade non-Catholics not to rush into misery by marrying a Catholic. 'But I have promised to marry him.' Break your promise [!], for you should not keep a promise to do wrong! Are there not many conversions resulting from mixed marriages? Yes, a few, but, oh, the loss on the other side! In the majority of mixed marriages the children are lost to the faith. If you are a Catholic, the fact that your Church condemns such marriages should be sufficient reason for you to avoid such an unhallowed union." (*Spiritual Pepper and Salt*, pp. 157, 158, as quoted in chapter on "Mixed Marriages of Catholics and Protestants" in *For Better Not for Worse*, p. 277.)

9

A certain statistician of our country says in regard to mixed marriages, "If both of the parents attend the same church, then seventy-eight per cent of the children go to church also; but if the father goes to one church and the mother to another, then only fifty-five per cent of the children go to church; and if only one

of the parents attends church, then only fifty per cent of the children go to church; and if one of the parents is a Protestant, the other parent a Catholic, then only thirty-eight per cent of the children go to church." (Quoted in *The Concordia Pulpit*, Vol. I, p. 252.) Realizing this and candidly admitting that mixed marriages "are a danger to the Catholic party and to the offspring" (Ostheimer, *Instructions*, etc., p. vii), is it any wonder that "the Catholic Church discountenances marriages between Catholics and non-Catholics," and, since the tyrannical power has been granted her by the Antichrist, even forbids them? "Everywhere the Church most strictly forbids marriages between two baptized persons one of whom is a Catholic and the other a member of a heretical or schismatic sect." (*New Code of Canon Law*, Canon 1060, quoted in chapter on "Mixed Marriages" in *For Better Not for Worse*, page 272.)

IV

It is with this latter problem, viz., marriage between Lutheran and Catholic, that we shall deal primarily as we now seek to answer the question "To what extent may and must action be taken in the case of mixed marriages?" This problem was uppermost in the mind of this conference when this question was assigned to us for study.

1

First of all, let it be said that no action should or can be taken in the case of mixed marriages that have been solemnized. Where a mixed marriage has been performed, in other words, where a mixed marriage is already a fact, no action whatsoever may be taken by us or by anyone else, for "what God hath joined together, let no man put asunder," and to put asunder also means to try to drive a wedge between, "to estrange, force, or entice away." Writes Paul in his First Letter to the Corinthians, chapter 7, verses 12-17: "If any brother hath a wife that believeth not and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And the woman which hath an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean; but now are they holy. But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases; but God hath called us to peace. For what knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife? But as God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk." Concerning this passage Luther writes: "Will also sagen: Der Glaube und christliche Stand ist so ein frei Ding, dass er an keinen Stand ver-

bunden ist, sondern ist ueber alle Staende, in allen Staenden, und durch alle Staende. Darum keine Not ist, dass du irgend einen Stand annehmest oder verlassest, dass du selig werdest; sondern in welchem Stande dich das Evangelium und der Glaube findet, da kannst du innen bleiben und selig werden. Darum ist's nicht not, dass du die Ehe laesest und von deinem unchristlichen Gemahl laufest um des Glaubens oder Seligkeit willen. Endlich, bist du ehelich, es sei mit einem Christen oder Unchristen, mit einem Frommen oder Boesen, so bist du darum weder selig noch verdammt. Bist du ohne Ehe, so bist du drum auch weder selig noch verdammt; das ist alles frei, frei; sondern wenn du ein Christ bist und bleibest, so wirst du selig; und wenn du ein Unchrist bleibst, wirst du verdammt." (St. L., VIII:1066.) The opinion of the Leipzig Theological Faculty, quoted by Walther and cited by us before, continues where we then stopped: "Jedoch aber, so eine solche Ehe waere getroffen worden zwischen einer lutherischen und halsstarrigen calvinischen Person, wuerde ihnen ein Prediger die Copulation und Benediction (weil solches mit der Religion eigentlich nichts zu thun hat und die irrende Person noch mit der Zeit moechte gewonnen werden 1 Kor. 7, 16) nicht versagen koennen." (Walther, *Pastorale*, p. 229.) We, therefore, may take no action whatsoever against existing mixed marriages.

2

But when a mixed marriage is contemplated, to what extent must we, or may we, take action? That depends upon a multiplicity of circumstances. Against the contemplated mixed marriage if betrothal has been consummated we may take no action whatsoever. When a couple comes to me and asks me to perform the wedding ceremony, this couple is, no doubt about it, engaged to be married, and "if an orthodox and heterodox person have been rightfully engaged, such engagement must not be broken." (Fritz, *Pastoral Theology*, p. 172.) "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." Luther writes: "Ich will auch nicht verwilligen in das Hinderniss, das sie nennen die Ungleichheit der Religion, dass weder einfachhin, noch unter der Bedingung, dass sie zum Glauben bekehrt werde, zugelassen sei, eine Ungetaufte zur Ehe zu nehmen. Wer hat das verboten? Gott, oder ein Mensch? Wer hat den Menschen die Gewalt gegeben, solche Ehe zu verbieten? Natuerlich die Geister, welche in Gleissnerei Luegenredner sind, wie Paulus sagt (1 Tim. 4, 2), von welchen dieses gesagt werden muss: Es haben mir die Boshaftigen Fabeln gesagt, aber nicht als dein Gesetz. Patricius, der Heide, hat die Monica, die Mutter St. Augustins, eine Christin, zur Ehe genommen; warum sollte das nicht auch heutiges Tages zugelassen sein? . . . Ich bitte dich, wo kommt doch dieses strenge Recht der Men-

schen gegen die Menschen her, welches doch Gott niemals erfordert hat?" (St. L., XIX:100.) Writes Walther (*Pastorale*, p. 228): "Ehen zwischen Rechtgläubigen und Irrgläubigen hat zwar ein Prediger alles Ernstes zu widerrathen, aber, wenn die Sache nicht mehr *in integro* ist, nicht zu hindern." W. A. Maier gives this well-directed counsel in *For Better Not for Worse*, p. 269: "Our conscious and deliberate counsel to all the young people of our Church who may be confronted by the prospect of interdenominational marriage should be this: 'Remember that you have pledged yourself by a sacred oath to your Church and its teachings and that you can tolerate no compromise with error in any form. You cannot permit even marriage to make you untrue to your Church and its divine truth. Consider very carefully all the factors that may be involved in a marriage with someone outside of your Church. If in the face of the warnings of experience you still feel, after deliberate and prayerful thought, that you must marry a member of another Church, then maintain your religious life and devotion to your own Church even more faithfully than before and hope and pray and work for the conversion of your life's helpmate to your faith and to the unity of hope and love which it inspires.'" The Apostle Peter gives this counsel: "Ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands, that, if any obey not the Word, they also may without the Word be won by the conversation of the wives while they behold your chaste conversation, coupled with fear." (1 Pet. 3:1, 2.)

At the same time the orthodox party, who contemplates marriage with a heterodox person, must be told: "Under no circumstances should an orthodox person violate his conscience in order to please the other party to the marriage; an orthodox woman, for instance, should not consent to be married by a Roman Catholic priest, much less promise to bring up her children in the Roman Catholic faith." (A Catholic priest will not marry without this promise; so the two points belong together.) "If the Roman Catholic will not be married by an orthodox minister, the marriage may be performed by a justice of the peace. If the Roman Catholic man refuses under such circumstances to marry the woman, he becomes guilty of breaking the engagement, and the woman is free." (Fritz, *Pastoral Theology*, p. 172.) "If the unbelieving depart, let him depart." (1 Cor. 7:15.) No one should violate his conscience or compromise his religion to please the unbeliever. (Matt. 10:37.)

3

If we, however, desire to counteract the tendency toward mixed marriages, our action must begin long before marriage is contemplated. Early instruction is the preventive. Warn against the

dangers of mixed marriages on the basis of Scripture passages quoted above (Gen. 6:2; Gen. 28:1, 2; Ex. 34:14-16; Deut. 7:1-4; Josh. 23:11-13; Judges 3:5-7; 1 Kings 11:1-9; Ezra 9:12; Neh. 13:23-27) as well as on the basis of experience and history. At no time is our action in the case of mixed marriages *per se* guided by Matthew 18 (the *locus classicus* on excommunication).

V

But the chief difficulty has not yet been touched. We have to speak now of our action concerning the promises exacted from the Lutheran if he wishes to be married by the Roman Catholic Church. — This case, however, arises only in those instances where the Roman Catholic has more religious backbone than the Lutheran. And why should that ever be the case? If the Roman Catholic has the right to insist that the ceremony be performed by his pastor, has the Lutheran not the same right? "But the Catholic Church will excommunicate!" Since when has Antichrist the power to excommunicate someone from the Church of Christ? When the Bishop of Vasona said to Savonarola: "*Separo te ab ecclesia militante atque triumphante*," (I separate you from the church militant and also the triumphant), did not the latter rightly answer: "*Militante, non triumphante: hoc enim tuum non est*." (From the militant, not from the triumphant; for that is not in your power)? Certainly good Lutherans have been instructed on this point and should be foolproof. — There is, however, more at issue than merely being married by the Roman Catholic Church. This issue never stands alone. Certain promises, or "antenuptial agreements," are requested and required; promises which a good Lutheran will shrink from making; promises, which, if a former Lutheran makes them, definitely stamp him as one who has denied his faith—not necessarily as one who is irrevocably lost, but, I repeat, as one who has denied the faith. "The non-Catholic party to the marriage is obliged to sign the following promises in the presence of two witnesses: 'I, the undersigned, not a member of the Catholic Church, wishing to contract marriage with N.N., a member of the Catholic Church, intend to do so with the understanding that the marriage tie cannot be dissolved except by death and promise him (her) on my word of honor that he (she) shall enjoy the free exercise of his (her) Catholic religion and that all children of either sex born of this marriage shall be baptized and educated in the faith and according to the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. I further promise that no marriage ceremony other than that to be performed by the Catholic priest shall take place.'" (*Our Sunday Visitor*, April 29, 1934, as quoted in the chapter on "Mixed Marriages of Catholics and Protestants" in *For Better Not for Worse*, p. 273.)

1

The first promise, as Ostheimer also points out in *Instructions for Non-Catholics Before Marriage*, is that the parties agree that the marriage bond shall last until death. This promise is just and right. The Catholic Church does not stand alone in this requirement. We also require our people to make the same promise, for it is in the very nature of the marriage bond that it shall last until death. We take no action against any Lutheran making that promise. It must not be overlooked, of course, that according to Roman Catholic teaching marriage, performed by a priest, is a sacrament and is indissoluble even in case of adultery.

2

"The second promise the Catholic Church asks of the non-Catholic is that the Catholic party shall not be prevented from exercising his Faith, and that nothing shall be done to make his practice of Faith difficult, if not impossible. For instance, the Catholic party should be permitted to attend Mass when obliged to do so, to abstain from meat on Fridays, and the like." (Ostheimer, *op. cit.*, p. 13.) On the surface this promise seems innocent and only a plea for tolerance. But here begins the Catholic strategy of isolation. The non-Catholic here promises to abstain from proselytizing, or missionizing, his spouse. That this promise is on the side of the Catholic Church, indeed an attempt to isolate its member and to keep the non-Catholic party from proselytizing the Catholic, becomes very evident when we note the promise made by the Catholic party. "I, the undersigned, a member of the Catholic Church wishing to contract marriage with N.N., do hereby promise that I will have all my children baptized and educated in the Catholic religion and that I will practice my religion faithfully and do all I can, especially by prayer, example, and the frequentation of the Sacraments, to bring about the conversion of my consort." (*Our Sunday Visitor*, April 29, 1934, as quoted in the chapter on "Mixed Marriages of Catholics and Protestants" in *For Better Not for Worse*, p. 273.) Certainly, fairness and religious liberty would require that no one be disturbed in the exercise of his faith. If, then, the non-Catholic should promise this tolerance, he may require that a like promise be given him. Never, however, should a Lutheran promise to be quiet about his religious convictions or to refrain from gaining his spouse for the true Church of Christ. "We ought to obey God rather than men," must be his principle also here (Acts 5:29). Our action, if such a promise is made? "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted" (Gal. 6:1). If he refuse to let himself be restored, that is another case.

3

The third promise asked by the Roman Catholic Church of the non-Catholic party "is to the effect that all children, of either sex, born to the couple shall be baptized and brought up in the Catholic Faith, even though the Catholic party should be taken away in death." (Ostheimer, *op. cit.*, p. 13.) Failure to keep this promise invalidates the marriage even after ten or fifteen years and brands the children as illegitimate. How can a Lutheran make that promise or conform to what Ostheimer himself calls "this apparently enormous demand"? Or, does he promise with the mental reservation "I will not keep the promise"? Not so. Ostheimer says: "These are the promises which the non-Catholic is asked to make, in writing, in the presence of the priest. A signature is not sufficient, there must be an intention to keep the promises as well. The Church does not force anyone, she merely lays down the conditions that she must demand. Of course, if one makes the promises, the man should be a gentleman, and the woman should be a lady, and keep them. One's word should be as good as one's bond." (Ostheimer, *op. cit.*, p. 14.) — Or does he promise with the mental reservation: "There will be no children!"? — In any case the promise is a denial of the faith. (It is conceivable that a "Lutheran," when and if he should make that promise, will say to himself: "When I on my Confirmation Day vowed 'Yes' to the question, 'Do you, as a member of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, intend to continue steadfast in the confession of this Church and suffer all, even death, rather than fall away from it?' I promised faithfulness as far as my own person is concerned, but not as far as the persons of my future children are concerned." But is he not now, in the case under consideration, promising in the person of his future children?) If a Lutheran is honestly convinced that "the doctrine of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, drawn from the Bible," as taught in Luther's Small Catechism, is the true one; if a Lutheran recognizes the Lutheran doctrine as Scriptural (which is diametrically opposed to the Catholic doctrine), he must also obey the command of the Lord "These words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children." (Deut. 6:6, 7.) No man-made promise can abrogate that command of the Lord. He who promises that he will not obey it denies his God and his faith. By this very promise, made before the Catholic priest, he openly says that the Roman Catholic Church is as good as the Lutheran, if not better. Shall we now tolerate such an one in our midst, so that we diminish not in numbers? Is it not better to deal with him, first in meekness according to Gal. 6, 1, then with evident firmness according to Matt. 18 — not because he married a Cath-

olic, but because he sacrificed his children on the altar of the Antichrist? The chapter on "Mixed Marriages of Catholics and Protestants" in *For Better Not for Worse* concludes with these telling words: "Because it is morally wrong for our young people to be married by Roman Catholic priests instead of by their own pastors, to receive the five required instructions from the priest, and to promise to have their children baptized and reared in Roman Catholicism, the Lutheran Church has been very emphatic in its warning against such alliances. Many of its congregations demand that members who have married Catholic life partners and pledged themselves to these non-Christian promises, must disavow these pledges and acknowledge their wrong. Where this is not done, the offending members are no longer regarded as communicants in the congregation." (P. 281.) He to whom it is immaterial whether his children are Christians or not can with difficulty be a Christian. He to whom it is immaterial whether his children are Lutherans or not can with difficulty be a Lutheran. But he who promises, solemnly promises, that his children shall not become Lutherans, how can he be a Lutheran, and how can the spirit of Lutheranism dwell in him or he be allowed to remain in the Lutheran Church? Answer, and we will rest our case!

4

"The fourth, and final, promise calls for a single marriage ceremony, and that before a priest. The reason for this is easily understood," writes Ostheimer, "for the priest officiating at a marriage is not only the representative of the Church, but an authorized representative of the civil authority as well—hence a double ceremony is entirely unnecessary." (Ostheimer, *op. cit.*, p. 14.) By reason of the same argument a single marriage ceremony before the Lutheran pastor is sufficient. With indignation a Protestant should reject the Roman Catholic claim that only if performed by a Roman Catholic priest will the marriage ceremony uniting a Catholic and a non-Catholic possess validity.*

So, then, to summarize. The question "To what extent may and must action be taken in the case of mixed marriages?" we answer: "Early instruction and warning on the basis of Scripture and experience is required to discourage mixed marriages." Is a mixed marriage contemplated and has the betrothal been consummated, earnest admonition should be given the Lutheran party to

* As a statement in *America* (R. C.), quoted elsewhere in this issue, shows, the Roman Church considers marriages of *non-Catholics* valid if performed before an other official than a Roman Catholic priest, but will not give such recognition if one or both parties married without Roman Catholic rites are members of the Roman Catholic Church. [Ed. Note.] Cf. C. T. M., Vol. III, pp. 751—755.

remain faithful to his Church and to endeavor to gain the spouse for the Lutheran Church—and the children also. "Dringend ermahnen," Walther puts it in *Pastorale*, p. 238. As concerning the promises required of the Lutheran who wishes to be married by a Roman Catholic priest, we must instruct our people as to the evident serious sinfulness of these promises. Has any person made the promises and, upon instruction, recanted, good! Does he remain stubborn, the case may develop into a case of church discipline, that will easily be settled if the Church is fundamentally sound in Lutheranism. If the Church is infested with like cases, this one added case will evidently become another cross, which the pastor must bear until the good Lord Himself shall deliver him from it.

Merrill, Wis.

RONALD W. GOETSCH

Luther: A Blessing to the English

VII. The Second English Lutheran Theological Seminary

From a small number at the time of William the Conqueror the monasteries had grown to about 1,200 at the Reformation, when they owned from one half to two thirds of the land.

As early as 1410 Parliament demanded their ending; Henry V suppressed over a hundred of them. Popes permitted bishops to suppress some and with the proceeds to build colleges. Henry VII used the monasteries of Mottisford and Luffield to build the chantry and hospital of Windsor.

In 1464 George Neville, archbishop of York, was given an honorary dinner of which this is the Bill-Afare: 80 fat oxen; 6 wild bulls; 300 hogs; 2,000 chickens; 200 kids; 4,000 ducks; 400 deer; 8 seals; 300 beavers; 300 pikes; 3,000 geese; 3,000 capons; 4,000 rabbits; 4,000 pigeons; 1,000 egrets; 300 pigs; 300 calves; 200 cranes; 100 peacocks; 4 porpoises; 1,000 quail; 200 pheasants; 200 woodcocks; 500 partridges; 75,000 herrings; 204 bitterns; 400 tarts; 5,000 plates of jelly; 4,000 cold custards; 1,004 rams; 150 venison pies; and 280,000 gallons of ale; 83,200 gallons of wine.

The abbot and thirty-two monks of Tewkesbury had 144 servants in livery wholly engaged in the service of the abbey.

In 1489 Pope Innocent VIII ordered Cardinal John Morton, archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, and the Pope's legate, to investigate all the regular clergy and punish as he saw fit.

A peer of the realm, William Abbot of St. Albans, within a few miles of London, was guilty of simony, usury, theft of the jewels of the sanctuary. His monks defiled "the holy places, even the very churches of God, by infamous intercourse with nuns."