

5-1-1944

## Miscellanea

P. E. Kretzmann

*Concordia Seminary, St. Louis*

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



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Kretzmann, P. E. (1944) "Miscellanea," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 15 , Article 28.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol15/iss1/28>

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](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

---



---

## Miscellanea

---

### The Ghost Is Not Yet Laid

Remarks have been made recently, also in print, stating in effect that the various theories concerning the levels reached by man's simian-like ancestor in his progress toward the status of *Homo sapiens* had been discarded. Certain developments in the field of ethnology were supposed to have eliminated the suggestions which were connected with the theory of evolution as it was imposed upon history, ethnology, anthropology, and several other related fields.

But it now seems that such reports were premature. Two very recent books have, in fact, refurbished the old theories and presented them as the assured results of modern scholarship. In the first of these two books, Bailey's *Daily Life in Bible Times*, the first chapter is headed "The Unfathomable Pit of Beginnings," and the author offers material on the "Old Stone Age," 1,500,000 to 10,000 B. C., dates which by no stretch of the imagination can be fitted into Bible times. The oldest skeletons or parts of skeletons of Palestine are assumed to be at least 150,000 years old. "Miss Garrod has named these people *Paleanthropus Palestinus*. They are similar in skeletal type to the Neanderthal man of Europe, though there are variations in the direction of *Homo sapiens*." The author then proceeds to state that this earlier cave dweller was driven out by some mysterious being with human elements in the Old Stone Age, about 1,000,000 to 10,000 years ago. With the Middle Stone Age came still another variety of being, under the heading of "Mediterranean," or, more exactly for Palestine, the "Natufian" man. It was only after the New Stone Age, 7,000 to 5,000 B. C., that people on the order of *Homo sapiens* appeared in Palestine, and only in the Copper-Stone Age, 5,000 to 3,000 B. C., can we connect up evidences found by archaeologists with the historical data supplied by the Bible account. After reading these paragraphs, with their wild speculations and subjective assumptions, we wonder just why they were included in a book which is evidently intended for the average lay Bible reader. The last paragraph of Chapter I characterizes the presentation well: "So from the darkness and gropings [!] of our bottomless pit we have climbed to the light of day, bringing with us the achievements of the millenniums. How few they are, and how slowly on the dial of time they appeared; but how invaluable and fateful nevertheless." (P. 11.)

The second recent book which again parades the evolutionistic theory of prehistoric events is McCown's *The Ladder of Progress in Palestine*. Chapter II of this monograph bears the caption "Seventy-five Thousand Years Before History Began." Its first sentence reads: "Palestine offers the most complete and continuous picture of prehistoric human evolution that is at present available in any part of the world." The author then refers to the *Sinanthropus peikinensis* of China, the *Pithecanthropus erectus* of Java, and particularly to the Neanderthal and Neanderthaloid skeletons of Palestine. He states that "the Galilee skull dates back to at least 40,000, perhaps even to 100,000 years ago, and actually

represents an entirely new species related to the genus *Homo*." (P. 20.) Then follows a long series of speculations prefaced by the question: "Was the Galilee man a true Neanderthaler?" After discussing the Natufian culture, the author takes up further questions in Chapter III, "The Search for the Earliest Inhabitants." Of course, the "Carmel man" is brought into the discussion. Yet the statement is made: "The question, then, as to the earliest inhabitant of Palestine is still in dispute and may not be settled for many years." (P. 41.) And further on: "The prehistorian is 100,000 years nearer the Palestinian Adam than he was when the last war ended. From 6,000 B. C. to 75,000 or 100,000, not to mention 500,000 years ago, is a tremendous leap." We certainly are inclined to agree to this last statement. In fact, the leap is entirely within the imagination of such explorers. P. E. K.

## Food for Thought from Krauth's "Conservative Reformation"

### 1. On the Unity of the Church

To true unity of the Church, is required hearty and honest consent in the *fundamental doctrine* of the gospel, or, in other words, in the Articles of Faith. It may surprise some, that we qualify the word doctrine by the word "*fundamental*"; for that word, in the history of the Church, has been so bandied about, so miserably perverted, so monopolized for certain ends, so twisted by artifices of interpretation, as if a man could use it to mean anything he pleased, and might fairly insist that its meaning could only be settled by reference to his own mental reservation at the time he used it, that at length men have grown afraid of it, have looked upon its use as a mark of lubricity, and have almost imagined that it conveyed an idea unknown to our Church in her purer days.

It is utterly false that Evangelical Lutherans are sticklers for non-fundamentals, that they are intolerant toward those who err in regard to non-fundamentals; on the contrary, no Church, apart from the fundamentals of the gospel in which her unity and very life are involved, is so mild, so mediating, so thoroughly tolerant as our own. Over against the unity of Rome under a universal Head, the unity of High-Churchism under the rule of Bishops, the unities which turn upon like rites or usages as in themselves necessary, or which build up the mere subtleties of human speculation into articles of faith, over against these the Lutheran Church was the first to stand forth, declaring that the unity of the Church turns upon nothing that is of man. Where the one pure gospel of Christ is preached, where the one foundation of doctrine is laid, where the "one faith" is confessed, and the alone divine Sacraments administered aright, there is the one Church; this is her unity.

We protest, therefore, alike against the basis which does not propose the fundamental doctrine of the gospel as essential to unity, and the basis, which, professing to accept the gospel fundamentals as its constituent element, is, in any degree whatever, dubious, or evasive, as to what subjects of gospel-teaching are fundamental, or which, pretending to define them, *throws among non-fundamentals what the Word of God and the judgment of His Church have fixed as Articles of Faith*. On

such a point there should be no evasion. Divine Truth is the end of the Church; it is also her means. She lives for it, and she lives by it. What the Evangelical Lutheran Church regards as fundamental to gospel doctrine that is what her existence, her history, her Confessions declare or justly imply to be her articles of faith, these ought to be accepted as such by all honorable men, who bear her name. (Pp.181—183.)

## 2. On the Need of Confession

But it is sometimes said, by very good men, as a summary answer to the whole argument for Confessions of Faith, that the very words of Scripture are a better Creed, than any we can substitute for them; better, not only, as of course they are, on the supposition that our words are incorrect, but better even if our words are correct; for our best words are man's words, but its words are the words of the Holy Ghost. But this argument, although it looks specious, is sophistical to the core. The very words of Scripture are not simply a better Rule of Faith than any that can be substituted for them, but they are the absolute and only Rule of Faith, for which nothing can be substituted. But the object of a *Creed* is not to find out what God teaches, (we go to the Bible for that) but to show what we believe. Hence the moment I set forth even the very words of the Bible as *my Creed*, the question is no longer what does the Holy Ghost mean by those words, but what do I mean by them.

The truth is that *correct human explanations* of Scripture doctrine are Scripture doctrine, for they are simply the statement of the same truth in different words. These words are not *in themselves* as clear and as good as the Scripture terms, but as those who use them can absolutely fix the sense of their own phraseology by a direct and infallible testimony, the human words may more perfectly exclude heresy than the divine words do. The term "Trinity," for example, does not, in itself, as clearly and as well express the doctrine of Scripture as the terms of the Word of God do; but it correctly and compendiously states that doctrine, and the trifler who pretends to receive the Bible, and yet rejects its doctrine of the Trinity, cannot pretend that he receives what the Church means by the word Trinity. While the Apostles lived the Word was both a rule of faith, and in a certain sense, a confession of it; when by direct inspiration a holy man utters certain words, they are to him both a rule of faith, and a confession of faith—they at once express both what he is to believe and what he does believe; but when the Canon was complete, when its authors were gone, when the living teacher was no longer at hand to correct the errorist who distorted his word, the Church entered on her normal and abiding relation to the Word and the Creed which is involved in these words: the Bible is the rule of faith, but not the confession of it; the Creed is not the rule of faith, but is the confession of it. A Lutheran is a Christian whose rule of faith is the Bible, and whose creed is the Augsburg Confession.

Our Confession is a human explanation of God's Word, but so far as it correctly explains it, it sets forth God's Word. The man who regards it as a correct explanation, or as "a summary and just exhibition" of the doctrines of which it treats, is consistently a Lutheran. No other man is. If any man can define Lutheran consistency in any better way,

we should be glad to have him do it; and if he thinks human explanations are something antagonistic to scriptural doctrine, we wish to know, if he be a clergyman or a Sunday School teacher, or a father, why he spends so many Sundays in the year in setting forth his "human explanation" to his people or his class or his children, instead of teaching them Hebrew and Greek. If he says that he believes that "human explanations" of the authorized version he reads, and of the sermons he preaches to his people, or the instruction he gives to his pupils or his children, are scriptural, because they agree with Scripture, we ask him to believe that his church in her faith, that the "human explanations" of her Confession (framed in earnest, prayerful study of the Holy Scriptures, and in the promised light of the Holy Spirit) are correct and scriptural, may have as much to justify her as he has in his confidence in his own sermons, or his own lessons. We do not claim that our Confessors were infallible. We do not say they could not fail. We only claim that they did not fail.

An age of darkness is a creedless age; corruption in doctrine works best when it is unfettered by an explicit statement of that doctrine. Between the Athanasian Creed (probably about A.D. 434) and the sixteenth century, there is no new General Creed. Error loves ambiguities. (Pp. 183—186 and 215.)

### 3. On Firmness in Confessing

Truthful separation is far better than dishonest union, and two Churches are happier, and more kindly in their mutual relations, when their differences are frankly confessed, than when they are *clouding with ambiguities and double meanings the real divergencies*. And even if two Communion are in downright conflict, it is better that the battles should be on the sides of clearly marked lines, or well understood issues — should be the struggles of nationalities, under the laws of war rather than the savage, ill-defined warfare of the border, and of the bush. . . . It is charged upon the Formula of Concord that it repressed the *Melanchthonian tendency* in our Church, and substituted the fossilization of the letter and of the dogma for the freedom of the spirit and of the Word. This again is not true. It is not true that the spirit within our Church which the Formula encountered was that of genuine freedom. It was rather the spirit which was making a real bondage under the pretenses of liberty, a spirit which was tolerant only to vagueness and laxity, not to well-defined doctrinal conviction. It was a spirit which softened and relaxed the Church when she needed her utmost vigor and firmness. It was a spirit of false deference to antiquity and human authority over against the Word. It yielded now to a false philosophizing, now to the Reformed, now to Rome. It tried to adjust some of the most vital doctrines to the demands of Rationalism on the one side, of Romanism on the other. (P. 328 f.)

### 4. The Glory of Lutheran Teaching on the Lord's Supper

All theology, without exception, has had views of the atonement which were lower or higher, as its views of the Lord's Supper were low or high. Men have talked and written as if the doctrine of our Church, on this point, were a stupid blunder, forced upon it by the self-will and

obstinacy of one man. The truth is, that this doctrine, clearly revealed in the New Testament, clearly confessed by the early Church, lies at the very heart of the Evangelical system—Christ is the center of the system, and in the Supper is the center of Christ's revelation of Himself. The glory and mystery of the incarnation combine there as they combine nowhere else. Communion with Christ is that by which we live, and the Supper is "*the Communion.*" Had Luther abandoned this vital doctrine, the Evangelical Protestant Church would have abandoned him. He did not make this doctrine—next in its immeasurable importance to that of justification by faith, with which it indissolubly coheres—the doctrine made him. The doctrine of the Lord's Supper is the most vital and practical in the whole range of the profoundest Christian life—the doctrine which, beyond all others, conditions and vitalizes that life, for in it the character of faith is determined, invigorated, and purified as it is nowhere else. It is not only a fundamental doctrine, but is among the most fundamental of fundamentals.

The Lutheran Church has suffered more for her adherence to this doctrine than from all other causes, but the doctrine itself repays her for all her suffering. To her it is a very small thing that she should be judged of man's judgment; but there is one judgment she will not, she dare not hazard, the judgment of her God, which they eat and drink to themselves who will not discern the Lord's holy body in the Supper of the Lord.

We do not wish to be misunderstood in what we have said as to the *moral* repugnance to our doctrine of the Supper. We distinguish between a mere intellectual difficulty and an aversion of the affections. How New Testament-like, how Lutheran have sounded the sacramental hymns and devotional breathings of men whose theory of the Lord's Supper embodied little of its divine glory. The glow of their hearts melted the frostwork of their heads. When they treat of sacramental communion, and of the mystical union, they give evidence, that, with their deep faith in the atonement, there is connected, in spite of the rationalizing tendency which inheres in their system, a hearty acknowledgment of the supernatural and incomprehensible character of the Lord's Supper. On the other hand, the evidence is overwhelming, that, as low views of the Lord's Supper prevail, in that proportion the doctrine of the atonement exhibits a rationalizing tendency. We repeat the proposition, confirmed by the whole history of the Church, that a moral repugnance to the doctrine that the body and blood of Christ are the medium through which redemption is *applied*, has its root in a moral repugnance to the doctrine that His precious body and blood are the medium through which redemption was *wrought*. (P. 656 f.)

