

Concordia Theological Monthly

Volume 15

Article 65

11-1-1944

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 65.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol15/iss1/65>

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.

Miscellanea

The New Approach in New Testament Study

By the REV. WILLIAM HALLOCK JOHNSON, D. D.

Just forty years ago, in 1904, I spent a summer semester in a German university at Jena and attended the lectures of Professor Wendt, a well-known New Testament scholar. The professor graciously invited the American students to his home for supper and paid us a compliment—of the left-handed variety. "You Americans," he said, "are a wonderful people; you are not satisfied with anything but the best. That's the reason you come over here to us."

We are now at war with Germany, but must acknowledge that to their credit or discredit the Germans have been the leaders in Biblical criticism. In the New Testament field, the mythical criticism of Strauss, the Tuebingen school of Baur, the eschatological school of Schweitzer, and more recently the Form Criticism of Dibelius and Bultmann, with the Barthian movement as well, have all come from Germany. It is refreshing at last to find that there is now an influential school of younger English-speaking scholars who are using the methods of criticism to rediscover the Gospel and to reaffirm its essential truths. How this has come about may be briefly told. Critics "from Reimarus to Wrede" have sought underneath the New Testament records for a Jesus who like John the Baptist "did no miracle," for a Jesus whose ministry involved no intrusion "ab extra" into the ordinary course of events, and whose Person was free from transcendent attributes. As one stage in this search the critics went back from Paul to Jesus, from the Epistles to the Gospels, but without success. The Gospels were then set one against another. Admittedly the Fourth Gospel drew the picture of a Divine Christ, the eternal Word of God, but it was thought that a different Jesus could be discovered in the earlier Gospels or in Mark, the earliest. Further study made it clear that no merely "human-historical" Jesus could be found in any of the Gospels. One of the keenest of the liberal critics, W. Bousset, declared that "already for Mark, Jesus is the miraculous eternal Son of God." The search was then continued in the literary sources of the Gospels, distinguished as (1) Mark, (2) the non-Markan material common to Matthew and Luke known as Q, and (3 and 4) the special matter in each of these Gospels called M and L. But M and L independently speak of Jesus as the Savior from sin, "God with us" (Matt. 1:21, 23), and as "a Savior, which is Christ the Lord" (Luke 2:11); and Q contains the majestic self-disclosure of Jesus, "All things are delivered unto Me of My Father; and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father," a saying of which Loisy remarks, "The Christ it designates is immortal, we may even say eternal." We cannot, as pointed out by E. F. Scott, disengage from our sources a purely human figure, a historical as opposed to a theological Jesus. The earliest documentary sources were as "Christological" as the Gospels that we have today.

In the laborious quest for the historical Jesus, that is, a Jesus who was not the Messiah and the Son of God, the documentary evidence yields the result that the building stones are of the same material as the finished structure. A large area, however, and a field tempting to critical ingenuity remained to be explored. This was the "no-man's land" of oral tradition, before the Gospels were written, a period reaching perhaps to the year 65 or to about 100 if we take Bultmann's figures. This inviting field the so-called Form Criticism has explored with great diligence and, for a time at least, with considerable success. Scattered traditions about Jesus, it was said, were treasured in memory and repeated with elaborations and accretions as the needs of the community, now for some reason called a church, required. These fragments of tradition were modified in two ways before the Gospels were written. They were run into certain "forms" or patterns of religious discourse (paradigms, in which a narrative is prefixed to a striking saying, miracle stories, etc.), and these "forms" had become so stereotyped as to be regarded as obligatory (*verbindlich*). Again there can be discerned a sort of "biology of the Sage" or psychological laws according to which legendary embellishments are added to a story to make it more effective as it passes from mouth to mouth. After many years, it is held, an anonymous author strung together these floating anecdotes and sayings of tradition, thus modified, adding editorially connecting links of time and place—"the house," "the lake," "the synagog," "the feast," etc.—and the result is one of our Synoptic Gospels.

Naturally enough, the Form Criticism itself has been subjected to a storm of criticism. For example, a French liberal critic, Goguel, insists that the "forms" that are distinguished—and no two authors agree in the classification—are all mixed forms. This means in effect that there are no forms so clearly defined and stereotyped as to influence the contents. Goguel says again that no certain laws for the development of legend have been discovered: "We are still unable to construct what Martin Dibelius calls a 'Biologie der Sage.'" As to the resemblance between the Gospel narrative and other literature, Jewish or Greek, he says that this does not prove literary dependence. "An analogy is not the equivalent of genealogy." It might be added that analogy need not detract from originality. Pericles long ago in his Funeral Oration praised the Athenian system of government, extolled the bravery of the Athenian soldiers, and called upon the citizens to follow their example; but this does not make Lincoln's Gettysburg Address any the less original. Finally it must be said that it is an injustice to Mark to describe it as a loosely strung series of floating anecdotes. If any piece of literature gives the impression of being a vivid, straightforward narrative, marching forward with rapid and orderly progress toward its appointed goal, it is the Gospel of Mark.

The Form Criticism in the main has been so negative in its results that it has not aided in the quest for the historical Jesus. It has served instead to show the hopelessness of that quest as usually conducted and has in fact brought this quest to a final impasse. Dibelius says that Mark in its final form is certainly a mythical book. Bultmann likewise

removes from the Gospel narratives most of their essential features and subjects the words of Jesus to a treatment if possible still more drastic. Neither of these authors can work backward and determine what manner of man Jesus really was. Neither can give any definite and reliable information as to the course of His ministry or the cause of His death. We can catch but a faint whisper of His voice as it dies away over the Galilean hills. Some people seem to think that the less we know about Jesus, the better we can worship Him; and in fairness it must be said that our authors in other writings seek to make Jesus available for faith by means of the Barthian dialectic. But as Form Critics they have reduced Jesus to an unknowable figure, the outlines of whose portrait are so dim that it can never be restored.

So much on the negative side. But on the positive side and somewhat incidentally the Form Criticism has done a service of great value to New Testament study. It has led to the discovery of a "form" of apostolic preaching behind the "forms" it describes. Challenging scholars to study afresh the New Testament material to see "whether these things are so," it has led to the discovery behind the alleged "forms" of a primitive and original form of apostolic preaching so fixed in content and so authoritative that preachers have perforce followed it ever since. Professor C. H. Dodd of Cambridge, in "The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development," finds the classical statement of the content of the Gospel in 1 Cor. 15:1-11: "That Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that He was buried and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures; and that He was seen of Cephas, etc." This Gospel was not the result of Paul's own invention or of the growth of Church theology; he "received" it, whether from the Christians at Damascus or from the Apostles at Jerusalem. In support of its truth he appealed to the leaders of the Jerusalem church, Peter and James, the Lord's brother, men still living, men known throughout the Church, and men with whom Paul had had intimate contact. "Whether it were I or they, so we preach." The statement carries us back to the earliest ages of the Church and shows that the Gospel which Paul preached in Corinth in the early fifties was the same as that which Peter preached in Jerusalem at Pentecost.

The same Gospel is set forth in brief in the first verses of Galatians, where we read that Christ was raised from the dead and that He "gave Himself for our sins, that He might deliver us from this present evil world." He assumes the knowledge of it in the Roman Church which He had not founded and had never visited. The Gospel, which was the power of God unto salvation, was promised in Holy Scriptures and concerned Jesus Christ of the seed of David, declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead. The same Gospel is set forth plainly in other epistles, such as 1 Peter and Hebrews. In Paul's first recorded sermon in Acts (chapter 13) he speaks of Jesus as of the Seed of David, foretold by the Prophets, pointed out by John the Baptist, put to death by Pilate, buried, "but God raised Him from the dead," seen by many witnesses, and "through this Man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins." Peter's recorded sermons at Jerusalem in

Acts 2 and 3 follow the same line: Jesus Christ, approved of God, foretold by Moses, David, and the Prophets, denied before Pilate, and crucified, "whom God raised from the dead," and preached in order that men should be turned from iniquity. A remarkably full outline of the Gospel is in Peter's words to the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius (Acts 10:36-43). Here is a statement of facts to which Peter can bear witness, but yet a Gospel offering to the believer peace and the remission of sins: The baptism of John, the preaching and healing ministry of Jesus in Galilee and Judea as He went about doing good, the apostolic band, the death on the cross, the resurrection on the third day, the appearance to chosen witnesses, the command to preach, the appointment of Jesus to be Judge of quick and dead, to whom all the Prophets bear witness, the remission of sins.

It is notable that Peter's address to Cornelius is a remarkably close and exact outline of the Gospel of Mark, which was based, as strong and credible tradition holds, on the preaching of Peter. The view that Mark is an anonymous collection of floating legends receives an emphatic negative.

These various statements of the "kerygma," or Gospel, whether preached by Peter or Paul, whether addressed to Jews or Gentiles, whether amplified historically in the Gospels or interpreted doctrinally in the Epistles, are mutually corroborative. They furnish the strongest kind of evidence that the Gospel of Pentecost and of the Gentile mission, of Peter and Paul and of Mark and John, were essentially the same. The newer criticism has turned toward unity and synthesis and away from the divisive tendencies of the continental critics. It has also emphasized the organic connection between the Gospel and Old Testament prophecy. We may come to see again that the massive structure of Scripture reveals a unity of design that points to a single architect. The newer critics, once more, have escaped from that fear of the supernatural which has dominated criticism for so many years. Says C. H. Dodd: "I believe that a sober and instructed criticism of the Gospels justifies the belief that in their central and dominant tradition they represent the testimony of those who stood nearest to the facts and whose life and outlook had been molded by them."

Jesus "came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom of God and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye, and believe in the Gospel" (Mark 1:14, 15). He proclaimed the Good News that God had entered history in fulfillment of His redemptive purpose and had inaugurated His rule among men in a kingdom that offered to meet men's deepest needs and promised to realize man's highest hopes. He saw in Himself and His work the fulfillment of the redeeming purpose of God. Behind every word is the consciousness that He is the fulfillment of the prophecies of the past and that His words have significance for all the future. He pointed forward repeatedly and unmistakably to His death and resurrection. The Apostles with fuller knowledge after these events happened caught the message from the lips of the Master and in the power of His Spirit preached the Gospel of "Jesus and the Resurrection," of "Christ and Him Crucified."

The cure for criticism is more criticism. New light will continue to break forth from the Word when it is studied with an open mind and an open heart. And when the returns are all in, it is safe to say that the Church will be singing:

**It is the golden casket Where gems of truth are stored;
It is the heaven-drawn picture Of Christ, the living Word.***

Major Problems Science Has Not Solved

By WHEELER BOGESS

(The writer of this article is a former missionary who served in South India. He has retired from foreign mission work and is now serving occasionally as supply preacher in this country. The article appeared in the *Watchman-Examiner* of August 3, 1944.)

Science has revealed much about the propagation of life, its maintenance, and its adaptability to environment, but it knows nothing about its origin. The greatest biologists now readily acknowledge that there is no spontaneous generation of life. Life can only come from previous life. The discoveries made by physiologists in their study of the various organs in every species of animal have revealed a remarkable inter-relationship of those organs, more complicated and more delicately adjusted than anything made by the most skillful of men. A noted physiologist, David Grant, said to a group of students, "No reasonable being can look upon the miraculous construction and arrangement of organs in this body without acknowledging that some Creative Power above and beyond human comprehension must have been responsible for them."

In the blood is found strong evidence of the wisdom and power of the Creator. The repeated statement in the first books of the Bible that "life is in the blood," has been proved scientifically accurate. The seeming intelligent actions of the red and white corpuscles is astonishing. The red corpuscles supply in kind and quantity whatever each wasted tissue needs. The white corpuscles rush to destroy or render innocuous every dangerous intrusion, even at the expense of their own lives.

Modern Research Uncovers More Mysteries

Modern research has taught us much about the various types of blood. Any given sample of blood can be identified as to the species of animal from which it came. A modern Jacob could not be deceived by his son's coat being stained with goat's blood (Gen. 37:33). Human blood shows four types. Whenever transfusions are made, one must be extremely careful not to mix types. One need not ask the color or nationality of one who gives blood for transfusion. The blood of a Negro is as good as that from a white man.

Chemists and metallurgists have discovered in the world eighty-nine basic elements and believe that there are three more. All forms of matter which have been analyzed are merely various combinations

* Not everything in the above article, which appeared in *The Presbyterian*, has our endorsement. We print it in its entirety because it furnishes much information on present-day critical endeavors and contains some positive emphasis of great value. — A.

of those elements. By skillful combinations, scientists have produced marvelous materials needed in every kind of industry. Modern knowledge and skill in the use of these materials have enabled men to accomplish wonderful results. But the origin of matter is still an unfathomed mystery. On earth and in the heavens we see continual change, so matter must have had a beginning. We can only ascribe it to an almighty Creator.

Astronomers astonish us with the information they give us about the heavenly bodies—their size, weight, distance, composition, the direction and velocity of their movements, but they cannot tell us how they came into being, or how they started to move. Only God could create them and make them move, how, he has not revealed. To mere man it is a mystery unsolved and unsolvable. Not even a theory is in sight.

Light is another mystery. Although man can produce light of many kinds and, through their rays, accomplish many strange things, he still does not know what light actually is and why and how it travels at the same rate as electricity, whatever may be its source. Increased knowledge of the laws governing refraction and reflection, together with observed chemical and biological changes effected by light, has made the greatest scientists wonder. Michael Pupin said, "The light of the stars is a part of the life-giving breath of God." The words of Scripture, "God is light," surely mean that light never had a beginning, but existed long before God said, in creating our little world, "Let there be light!" [Here we do not agree with the author. Ed.] Since these things are so, we can expect light to continue throughout eternity, while we continue to learn more and more about Him who is called both "Light" and "Love."

"The Secret of the Lord is With Them that Fear Him"

Electricity and magnetism, notwithstanding all that man knows about them and their laws, are still among the great unfathomed mysteries. In almost numberless ways they have been made to serve man, enabling him to accomplish what was formerly impossible, and might truly be called "miracles" of science. Almost every day new uses are found for these invisible forces. Yet, how little is the voltage man can generate with his largest dynamo compared with what God generates in the atmosphere of earth. What He generates in the numberless heavenly bodies throughout the universe is beyond computation or even imagination.

The wind is another mystery, itself invisible and known only by what it does. Honest meteorologists frankly admit that their forecasts of weather are little more than guesses. None of them can accurately predict either flood or famine. As Jesus said, "The wind bloweth where it listeth; thou hearest the sound thereof but canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth." The origin of the wind is not known. Observations taken over a wide area showing the wind's direction, temperature, force, velocity, and barometric pressure form some basis for predicting weather conditions for a few hours or for a day, but even these often change suddenly without warning or known cause.

Many modern scientists of the highest rank have emphatically declared their belief that the universe evidences the knowledge, wisdom, and power of an infinite Creator. Such statements by men like Eddington, Lodge, Jeans, Millikan, Compton, Mather, Pupin, Edison, Einstein, Carver, Tillyard, and many others cannot be lightly disregarded. Says Edison, "After years of watching the processes of nature, I no more doubt the existence of an Intelligence that is running things than I doubt the existence of myself." Pupin, on his deathbed said, "The soul of man is the highest product of God's creative handiwork."

Millions of common folks of all grades and nationalities can add their testimony, based on their own experience, that Jesus has brought into their souls those changes He promised to all who truly repent of their sins and believe in Him as their Savior and Lord. Even many non-Christians acknowledge the miraculous improvement they have seen in many followers of Jesus.

Our conclusion to this whole matter is that we can be confident that any seeker for truth will find it in proportion to his honest effort and faithful acknowledgment. Those who find Christ to be all He claimed will continue throughout eternity to learn more and more about Him whose name and nature is Truth.

Fade-Out of Evolution

By ARTHUR I. BROWN

Dr. Brown is a Bible teacher and an authority on Christian evidences. He was formerly an outstanding medical specialist, but gave up his practice to serve the churches.

A recent letter in your columns stated that "evolution is God's way of working." As this is an important and timely question, perhaps you will allow me space to correct briefly this popular idea, held even by many sincere Christians who are under the spell of overenthusiastic proponents of evolution.

We hear and read much about the "consensus of scientific opinion" supporting a belief in transformism or an ancestral association with lower animals. To many people, this fiat of infidel science must be accepted without question. However, when we investigate, we discover that evolution is not accepted by all eminent scientists.

This writer at one time believed in evolution and has been trained under some of the highest evolutionary authorities in the world. When he began to do some independent thinking, he found so many glaring inconsistencies, so many gross absurdities, and such a woeful lack of evidence, where evidence ought to be abundant, that he was forced, somewhat reluctantly, to abandon this hypothesis.

Bible and Nature Say "No!" To affirm that "evolution is God's way of working" implies that we are in possession of facts which support that conclusion. God has spoken to us in two ways. He has spoken through His Word and in nature. What do we hear from His Word? Absolutely not a hint that humanity has any kind of genetic relationship with animals. We read everywhere of God's power and wisdom in creation, and never anything of evolution. If evolution is God's method, then

the Bible is not true, and God is a liar. Does the Bible say one thing and mean another?

In nature practically all the facts are against evolution. At the present time many distinguished scientists are now admitting this.

The limitations of space prohibit any technical discussion of the arguments presented by evolutionists, but it is enlightening to notice briefly the names of a few of the many scientists who are now opposing the current belief in this strange doctrine.

On the continent of Europe the pendulum of scientific thinking is swinging away from evolution. Men like Deperet, Carazzi, Vialleton, Fleischmann, Caullery, Dewar, and many others are unequivocally expressing themselves in opposition to their former belief.

Professor Paul Lemoine, the great French geologist, has spoken very positively. He was selected to write the article on evolution for the latest edition of *The Encyclopedia of France* (1938), and, after a long and comprehensive survey, he closes with these words:

It will be seen from this discussion that evolution is impossible. At bottom, in spite of appearances, nobody believes in it any longer.

This positive assertion is quoted in the Proceedings of the Geological Society of France, April 4, 1938, with approval and with the editorial comment that practically all French geologists accept Lemoine's conclusion.

Many other great scientists could be quoted. Some are not yet willing to abandon completely their former pet theory, but admit that they hold to it now only as "an act of faith." Science has failed to produce corroborative evidence. As far as the facts go, some of them admit that the evolutionary structure is tottering to an ignominious fall.

Bias Against the Bible. The writings of Caullery, Austin H. Clark, Ernest Albert Hooton, Richard Goldschmidt, Sumner, Shull, and others who still claim to be evolutionists plainly reveal that this theory has a very insecure foundation. The reason men cling to it seems to be that they have a bias against the Bible and the supernatural, an antagonism which exists even in the face of a mass of irrefutable fact supporting the Word of God in its entirety.

How, then, can it be affirmed that God's method is the process of evolution, leading humanity by a devious, unknown, age-long route from amphioxus to anthropoid to man? Where is there a scintilla of proof? The Bible denies the validity of evolution, and every realm of nature does the same.

Some speak of "creative evolution" and imagine that by bringing these two words together they have solved the difficulty. But "theistic evolution" is a botch attempt at a synthesis of two systems of belief which are irreconcilable.

It may be asked: "What difference does it make—either method glorifies God equally?" It makes a great difference. What are we going to do with this infallible Word of God? With no uncertain voice it proclaims creation. If we deny this and substitute evolution, we are placing ourselves in direct opposition to God Himself, denying either His truthfulness or His knowledge. Evolution takes from Jesus Christ that

pre-eminence which rightly belongs to Him. In Colossians 1:16-18 He is shown to be the Creator:

All things have been created through Him and unto Him; and He is before all things, and in Him all things hold together . . . that in all things He might have the pre-eminence.

An intelligent, unbiased student—and this applies especially to Christians—must relinquish evolution. It has failed to produce the necessary proofs of its validity and is shown to be a base and subtle attempt to minimize the majesty of God and to deify the humanity of man. Let us refuse to be fooled by this obvious effort of the arch-enemy to lure us away from allegiance to the Lord Jesus Christ.

Watchman-Examiner, June 29, 1944

A Good Plea for the Old Type of Theological Education

In the *Episcopal Recorder*, a monthly publication issued in the interest of the Reformed Episcopal Church, the associate editor, Bishop William Culbertson, publishes an interesting and helpful editorial having the title "A Protest Against a Widespread Educational Tendency." The editorial appeared in the issue of November, 1943. We reprint the greater part of it.

"The writer of this editorial is not pleading for a formal disciplinary concept of education. That there were excesses in the matter of impractical subject matter, we admit. But we do raise a real question as to whether or not certain subjects, at least an acquaintance with them, is as impractical as the advocates of the Dewey conception of education would make us believe. We were interested to read in one of our outstanding secular magazines the following: 'It is often said that a year or two of Greek or Latin is time wasted, because the beauties of Greek and Latin literature cannot be revealed in that time. That is wrong. Just one year of Greek or Latin may be made a revelation, a turning point in life. I will not rehearse the familiar arguments for studying the so-called dead languages. Their life leaps forth if they are entrusted to the proper hands.' And again, 'With such a year behind him, even if the pupil has no chance for more, he will be able, when driven by Milton to Virgil or by Chaucer to Ovid in later days, to track out with the help of a translation the secrets of the original which no translation alone could have shown him.' Without committing ourselves to all that we have quoted, we feel that there is much food for thought here. We thought of the theological field in particular, however. If something can be said for a study of the dead languages in academic education, how much more can be said for such a study in theological education?

"Many theological seminaries, particularly those with a liberal emphasis, have relegated the study of the original languages in which the Bible was written to the limbo of forgetfulness. Such impracticality! ejaculate the proponents of the new system. Psychology, Sociology, Economics, Political Science came in, and Hebrew and Greek went out. And what Psychology, Sociology, Economics, and Political Science came in! Mechanistic, materialistic, unbelieving, pinkish—to say the

least. But aside from the kind of subjects which displaced the study of Hebrew and Greek, is their displacement really scientific? Our answer is Yes, if you want a generation of ministers who know nothing of the Bible, who therefore are unable to explain what it means and who are powerless to defend it. What if some seminary students indolently never use the tool given them; does that make the study worthless? For those who do not use such instruction (and whose preaching must in proportion fall short so far as real Bible study is concerned), there are others who do use, and there are multitudes who wish they had it. It is the conviction of this writer that what will stand before the Lord so far as the minister is concerned, is not how brilliant his oratory or how keen his analysis of human nature or how highly he is regarded by his community, but rather how much he has instructed his people in the Book of God—God's will.

"Ministers who believe, who live, who preach, who teach the Word of God will secure the future usefulness of any denomination. When human opinions and calculations have long since passed as fads and worthless conjectures, the Word of God will stand. Happy is that people who have such a minister—for their eternal good, for the local church's testimony, and for the local church's permanence."

These are important words. May they be pondered by all of us as we prayerfully study the questions having to do with the future of theological education in our own Church.

The Chronology of the Two Covenants

(Gal. 3:17; cp. with Ex. 12:40)

Is there a discrepancy between the two passages given above? And are they out of harmony with the statements found in Gen. 15:13 and Acts 7:6? The following facts will assist in solving the difficulty which seems to be connected with the chronology of the two covenants, that made with Abraham and that made with Moses.

It is, of course, generally known and can easily be demonstrated that the chronology which was taken into the margin of the Authorized Version, as worked out by Bishop Ussher of Armagh (1581—1656) is not reliable in many of its statements; above all, it cannot be placed on a par with the inspired account of the Bible text itself. If anyone wishes to operate with the Ussher list, he must do so with great care.

In the second place, we must keep in mind the fact that while the Bible frequently mentions years in connection with important events, we do not often find the point of departure and the point of arrival (the *terminus a quo* and the *terminus ad quem*) fixed in such a way that we know precisely in what year before or after Christ a certain event occurred. Although Luke, for example, is quite exact in fixing the time of certain happenings (e.g., Luke 2:2; 3:1,2; Acts 18:2), scholars are not yet fully agreed as to the chronology of either the life of Jesus or that of Saint Paul. In other words: Frequently we know exactly, or almost so, how many years elapsed between two given events, but we do not have the dates of the *terminus a quo* or the *terminus ad quem* and therefore find it rather difficult to assign definite dates to important events

from the Scripture account itself. If secular history provides us with a date or a point of departure which is beyond a reasonable doubt, the matter is considerably simplified, but it still does not yet give us the absolute truth which we have in the inspired account. For example, as pertaining to the date of our Savior's birth: Luke 2:1 and Luke 3:23 give us a starting point for our calculations, but then we must consult also Matt. 2:1 and John 2:20, in order to get reasonably close to the exact date. After that we consult secular history and archaeology, in order to find out just when census edicts were issued and what factors may have expedited or hindered the census referred to by Luke. The same difficulties present themselves in the Old Testament, and possibly in an even greater degree, because the available secular sources are often less reliable than those of a later date.

In the third place, we occasionally are obliged to struggle with the difficulty of sources. There can be no doubt of the correctness of the transmitted text of the Old Testament in all the points pertaining to our salvation, for there the quotations in the New Testament as well as the translation of the Old Testament into Greek, known as the Septuagint, give us ample corroboration. But in one respect we find occasional puzzles, namely, in that pertaining to numbers. Quite frequently the Septuagint has other figures pertaining to certain events than the present Hebrew text, and we are at a loss to determine whether the translators of this unique document had a more accurate text of the Hebrew before them or whether they, like many copyists who labored through the centuries, inadvertently made an error in transcribing numbers (or figures) found in the copies before them. Whenever, therefore, we are dealing with figures, and especially with dates, we try to find verification or corroboration in the New Testament or in some other reliable source.

In this manner it has been possible to come very close to the text as originally written down by the inspired authors, and the science of hermeneutics, especially as handled by Lutheran and other conservative scholars, has proved its value.

Now let us proceed to the specific difficulty confronting us, as stated in the first paragraph above. We may say at once that we are not greatly concerned about the round numbers given for the stay of the children of Israel in Egypt, Gen. 15:13 and Acts 7:6, for in either case the purpose is evidently only that of fixing a period of time in a general way. But in Gal. 3:16,17 the Apostle writes: "Now, to Abraham *and his seed* were the promises made. . . . And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the Law, which was *four hundred and thirty years* after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." And in Ex. 12:40,41 we are told: "Now, the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was *four hundred and thirty years*. And it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the selfsame day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt." There can be no doubt, in either case, that the text intends the four hundred and thirty years to embrace *the stay of the children of Israel in Egypt*. Hence the changes in the Septuagint text and in some of the New Testament manuscripts,

in an effort to shorten this time, are not acceptable. This is evident from much corroborative material contained in other Scripture passages, as when 1 Chron. 7:20-27 gives nine or even ten generations between Ephraim and Joshua, the generations at that time being reckoned, as we see from the Book of Numbers, at approximately forty years.

In order to get at the root of the difficulty, we might look at a few other facts. For example, it seems that Abraham received the first Messianic promise when he was 75 years old, Gen. 12:3, 4. But the words of promise specifically using the word "Seed" were not given until the episode of the sacrifice of Isaac, which must have occurred some 35 years later, or when Isaac was some ten years old. Which date are we to regard as the date of the covenant? It is clear, furthermore, that the Messianic promise, even before the sojourn in Egypt, was transmitted in approximately the same form to Isaac and Jacob. Does it not seem evident that Saint Paul had just this fact in mind when he wrote: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made"?

Let us next take up a chronological tag which has been regarded as the key passage for the fixing of Old Testament history, namely, 1 Kings 6:1, where we read: "Now, it came to pass in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt . . . that he began to build the house of the Lord." As nearly as can be determined on the basis of history and archaeology, the date when Solomon began the building of the Temple at Jerusalem was about the year 1000 B. C. (somewhere between 1010 and 960). Suppose we take the date 960 and work backward. The 480 years of this text plus the 430 years of Ex. 12:40 would bring us back to 1870, as the date of Jacob's coming to Egypt. Jacob was 130 years old when he came to Egypt, Gen. 47:9, and he had been born to Isaac when the latter was 60 years old, Gen. 25:26, or approximately 50 years after the "sacrifice" of Isaac by Abraham, which brought about the promise of the covenant referring to the "Seed." Gen. 22:18. This would make the date of this blessing about 2050 B. C.

Let us pause here a moment to see what noted scholars say concerning the approximate dates of Abraham and of his contemporary Amraphel, or Hammurabi. Clay (*Light on the Old Testament*, 130) places Hammurabi at 2100 B. C., Price (*The Monuments and the Old Testament*, 54) gives the date from 2123 to 2081, Adams (in "Review and Expositor") places Abram's migration in 2092 B. C., but does not place it in relation to Hammurabi's reign, Langdon (quoted in Marston, *New Bible Evidence*, 95) thinks that Hammurabi's dates are between 2067 and 2024 B. C. In the same connection Marston calculates, in connection with other chronological figures, that Abram came into Canaan in 2085 B. C. and that Isaac was born in 2060 B. C. This agrees exactly with the computation made in the paragraph above.

All of which tends to show that the 430 years spoken of by Paul in Gal. 3:17 f. cannot possibly be figured from the first covenant of God with Abram in approximately 2085 B. C., nor even from that of 2050 B. C. Let us, therefore, for a moment digress in order to find what eminent scholars say with reference to our difficulty. The noted com-

mentator Carl Friedrich Keil remarks on Ex.12:40 f.: "The sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt had lasted 430 years. This figure is not to be placed beyond question by Ankelos, the Syriac Version, the Vulgate, the ing to the cue of the Septuagint . . . to be reduced to 215 years, by an arbitrary insertion. This chronological reference, whose originality is placed beyond question by Onkelos, the Syriac Version, the Vulgate, the Sahidic and the Venetian Greek, not only harmonizes with the prophecy of Gen.15:13, where in prophetic speech the round number 400 is mentioned, but may also be harmonized without trouble with the various genealogical lists. . . . This last genealogy (1 Chron.7:20 ff.) shows in the plainest manner the impossibility of the opinion originating from the Alexandrian Version, namely, that the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt had lasted only 215 years, since ten generations, each figured at 40 years will agree with 430, but definitely not with 215 years."

A very fine discussion of the difficulty is given by Hovey, in *The American Commentary on the New Testament*, p.45 f., on Gal.3:17. He writes:

Though the bearing of this verse on Paul's argument is very clear, objection has been made to it as containing an erroneous statement. For the words, "which came four hundred and thirty years after," are said to imply that the whole period, from the first [?] giving of the promise to Abraham to the giving of the Law, was only four hundred and thirty years; while Ex.12:40,41, where, and where only, the same period is mentioned, show that the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt was four hundred and thirty years. Compare the language of Stephen in Acts 7:6, and Hackett's note on the same. The sojourn in Egypt is there spoken of as four hundred years. But, according to the best computation, two hundred and fifteen years elapsed between the time when the promise was first given [namely when Abram left Chaldea] and the time when Jacob and his sons went down into Egypt at the invitation of Joseph; so that [if that were true] the Law came more than six hundred years after the promise. What shall be said of this discrepancy? This, in the first place, that Paul's reasoning is not affected in the slightest degree by the length of the period. The Law was given long after the promise—whether four hundred and thirty years or six hundred and forty-five years, more or less, is of no consequence. It was enough for him to refer to the period in such terms as would bring it distinctly before the minds of his readers. He is not fixing a point of chronology, but recalling a well-known period. Accordingly—1. Paul may have followed the Septuagint, which contains an addition to the Hebrew text of Ex.12:40, making it read, "in the land of Egypt and in the land of Canaan," and may have done this because the Greek version was sufficiently accurate for his purpose and was generally used by the Galatians. His object was not to teach them Biblical chronology, but to remind them of the fact that the Law was given long after the promise and could not be supposed to destroy or change the latter. 2. He may have followed the Hebrew text, making the *close*, instead of the beginning of the patriarchal age, the starting point in his reckoning; for the promise was repeated to Isaac and Jacob, and was, therefore, contemporaneous with the whole patriarchal period. With this would agree the plural, "promises," in verse 16, if this plural relates to a repetition of essentially the same promise, which is certainly probable. . . . In no case can the truthfulness of Paul's language be impeached.

If we once more examine the text in Galatians, in connection with this last argument, we find that the text indeed supports the contention exactly. It reads: "But to Abraham were spoken the promises and

to his seed." If we both here and in the next clause understand "seed" of the Savior (which it certainly is at the end of the verse), then the explanation of the *Popular Commentary* will give the full comfort of the promise along Messianic lines. If the word "seed" in the first part of the sentence is to be understood of offspring or descendants, we have the explanation that the Messianic promise, as given to Abraham in the first place, was repeated in the case of Isaac and Jacob. Thus we have the whole period of the Messianic prophecy in Canaan included in verse 16. In other words, the reference to the covenant is not to any specific announcement to Abraham alone but to the promise as given to the patriarchs.

Now verse 17 follows, in the transcription of the *Popular Commentary*: "Some four hundred and thirty years later, Ex. 12:40, counting from the journey of Jacob into Egypt to the exodus of the children of Israel, the Law was given by God from Mount Sinai." That is: Between the time of the covenant promises to Abraham (Isaac, and Jacob), taken as a unit fact, and the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai, we have the 430 years of the Egyptian sojourn. P. E. KREIZMANN

The Ouija Board and Other Occult Matters

In the *Lutheran Standard* for June 24, 1944, Dr. C. B. Gohdes of Capital University, Columbus, Ohio, discusses the questions "What is the Christian's attitude toward the 'ouija board?'" and "How can we explain the remarkable feats that Dr. Dunninger is broadcasting?" The remarks of Dr. Gohdes are so interesting that we submit them *in toto*. Whether or not everything he says is tenable, his views deserve consideration.

"1. The employment of the ouija board is one of several practices which are utterly reprehensible when the purpose is to communicate with the dead. The attempt to communicate with the dead by means of the ouija board, table rapping, the consultation of mediums, etc., is a species of witchcraft, forbidden in God's Word. As such it is an expedient of the devil to deceive and destroy souls. In any event it is deception, since communication with the dead is impossible.

"However, there is another side to the matter. The phenomena appearing in connection with the ouija board, table rapping, and the investigation of mediumistic powers call for scientific explanation. This has been forthcoming, and its character has been so convincing that the utter untenableness of occult beliefs has become evident to the serious student. Now that spiritualism and other measures of dealing with the dead are bound to gain greater vogue in view of the numerous casualties due to the war, the scientific basis of psychic phenomena should be studied by all educators so that the victims of bereavement may not also be victimized by the cunning or stupidity of occultists.

"When, by way of example, the ouija board is used not simply as a social pastime, but left to the psychic forces of those who have their hands on it, it may become the medium of information of which the manipulators were not previously in conscious possession. The explanation of this surprising fact is that when the function of the ordinary mental powers is suspended, those of the subliminal, subconscious self,

ordinarily inactive or, at least, not active in the sphere of consciousness, may assert themselves. In that case the subconscious memory may release its contents, or information may be imparted to the operators by others through telepathy, or suggestion may bring about what is mistaken for information from the dead. It has happened that a psychic, in a cataleptic state, put a poem on paper by automatic writing which the 'spirit' believed to be in control of the psychic acclaimed as his own. Those present at the seance fell for the plagiarism until it was ascertained that the poem was in print, had been memorized by the psychic years before, had been duly forgotten, but had nevertheless remained on deposit in the subconscious memory, to be released when the ordinary powers of the mind, working through the brain, were suspended in a state of trance.

"The psychic powers discovered by the scholars in the fields of parapsychology and psychometry are principally extrasensory perception and telekinesis. The latter means the power to move material objects from a distance, not by muscular or any other physical power but by psychic power. The former means that information is received not by any of the five senses but through immediate psychic impact. Neither time nor space count in these psychic phenomena. By way of example, a fatal accident occurring in India was seen in England in all its vividness through extrasensory perception the very instant it occurred in the former country. As to telekinesis, like extrasensory perception, it is independent of time and space. That such power is not physical is evidenced by the fact that any physical force is subject to what the mathematicians call the law of inverse square. Thus, a thousand miles from the place of its origin, any material force—radiant, electric, kinetic—unless reinforced by the way, is but a millionth of what it was at the start. Psychic force, on the other hand, such as extrasensory perception and telekinesis, are subject to no such limitation.

"2. Dr. Dunninger is a psychic who possesses to an extraordinary degree the power of extrasensory perception. While his exploits are inexplicable in the present stage of the science of parapsychology and psychometry, there is absolutely no reason to ascribe the indisputable facts to the interposition of demons. Dr. Dunninger's feats are really modest in comparison with others so astounding as to appear incredible but for the preclusion of fraud by the sober scientists who observed and recorded the facts. As illustration I cite the case of Senora Reyes, a Mexican psychic, minutely observed by a man held in great repute by his colleagues, a German physician in Mexico City by the name of Pagenstecher. This woman, when in a hypnotic state, was given a sealed letter, the contents of which were absolutely unknown to herself and the learned investigator. Putting the tips of her ten fingers upon it, she not only obtained knowledge of its contents, but of the circumstances in which it was written: the sinking ship (probably the *Lusitania*), torpedoed by a German U-boat; the terrible scenes enacted on the doomed vessel; the identification of the writer who, after composing his farewell message to his family, put the same into a bottle and threw it into the sea. (It drifted to the Azores, whence the latter was sent to

the U-boat victim's widow.) The detailed, accurate, unmistakably correct description of the writer of the letter is warrant of the veracity of the psychic's account.

"The visioning of past events through extrasensory perception has been demonstrated so often that it must be accepted as scientific fact. Such amazing discoveries in the fields of parapsychology (the sphere beyond psychology) and psychometry (the measuring of powers purely psychic) have an immensely practical bearing. They give the knockout blow to the materialistic and mechanistic philosophy. Knowing that the human soul has powers such as have here been described, we can believe that God is pure Spirit, who tossed worlds into space and keeps the universe moving with the regularity of a clockwork. Likewise do they give the knockout blow to spiritism. The powers operative in phenomena commonly ascribed to spirit influence — information obtained at the ouija board, table rapping, writing on the inside of slates bound together, objects kept moving through the air by occult force, thought reading, even materialization, largely stand explained as due to forces possessed and employed by the human soul. The often amazing phenomena of the seance are psychic phenomena. It is easy for the investigator to do away with the spiritistic explanation of the amazing occurrences in connection with mediums who have made history in the sphere of the occult if he is but well enough read that he is able to parallel such occurrences with others in which the dead could not possibly have had a part."

A.

"Social Action" by Congregation

At summer schools and institutes of the constituent synods of the United Lutheran Church, three members of the Board of Social Missions of that body have presented a definite program of social action which can be worked out by individual congregations. These three men, Rev. E. E. Flack, D.D., Ph.D.; Rev. Herman S. Keiter, Ph.D.; and Rev. C. Franklin Koch, D.D., constitute a committee of the board appointed this spring to work out and implement such a program, as a practical outgrowth of the findings of the Hartwick Seminary Conference on the Social Mission of the Church held at Princeton, N.J., during the winter. Phases of the program deal with the following factors: The Bases of Social Action — Scriptural, Lutheran, Ecumenical; Social Problems Demanding Action; Efforts Now at Work Attempting to Solve These Problems — including national and international agencies; Relation of Church to Family; Relation of Church to Other Agencies; Suggestions for Congregational Social Action, — which include 22 practical approaches to current social problems; Suggestions for Conference and Synodical Action; and Suggestions for United Lutheran Church and World Action.

The committee interprets the inauguration of this program as "an advance step which will enable the local congregation to grasp the better its opportunity in this strategic field of Christian service" and, in order to clear confusion existing in the minds of many concerning the scope of "social action," offers the following definition:

"Social Action is the effort of individuals or groups, impelled by the Spirit of God, through love for their fellow men, to seek to relieve,

restrain, and prevent certain forms of physical, social, economic, and spiritual evils; and to restore, recreate, and strengthen the lives of individuals and communities, thus striving for the realization of a social order in which truth, justice, brotherhood, and love shall prevail, to the end that the purposes of God may be accomplished in human lives.

"Social action cannot exist apart from evangelism and may be described as evangelism of the social order,—'That the world through Christ might be saved.' Social action is differentiated from inner missions in that the latter deals with unfortunate people and emphasizes the ministry of mercy, whereas the former deals with unwholesome social situations and emphasizes the building of a Christian social order."

So reports the *News Bulletin*, N. L. C.

We are in full sympathy with every legitimate effort to combat social evils. But it must not be forgotten that the Church's business is to preach the Gospel. How tragic if the Church should come to be regarded as an agency for social betterment! It would mean that a by-product would be elevated to the position of chief objective. A.

Some Facts about the Ministry of Jonathan Edwards

In the *Presbyterian* of September 7 there appears a travelog in which the writer speaks of the work of Jonathan Edwards in Northampton and Stockbridge, Mass. The section deserves being reproduced here.

"Northampton itself has made a great contribution to the religious life of America. It was at the old First Congregational Church that the noted young Jonathan Edwards, as the successor to his grandfather, the able Dr. Stoddard, helped, humanly speaking, to begin one of the greatest early revivals in this country. It was one that antedated the revival that was carried forward by the great George Whitefield, in the pre-American Revolutionary days. And a revival that shook New England deeply—yes, a spiritual season of awakening that did not alone stress great fundamental doctrinal truths, but made clear and convincing the need of a real change of heart as the inner self was touched intellectually and emotionally by the Spirit of Christ. That giant philosopher, theologian, psychologist, and Christian leader gripped wonderfully his generation in New England, in the 1740's. Maybe he was more preacher than pastor, or he would never have been forced out of his pulpit after a remarkable pastorate of twenty-three years. Everything that he read, studied and reflected, had to be grist for his sermonic mill. On long horseback rides he would pin the points and thoughts for a sermon (written on little slips of paper) to his clothing, so that his garments would be nearly covered by the time that he arrived at home. He also took his part in the life of other churches round about. State Senator Judd, of the Southampton church, told me personally several years ago that the church at Southampton had on its early records how Edwards had moderated some of its congregational meetings, when pastorless, back in the fore half of the eighteenth century.

"And then the day came when, trying to remedy the loose church practices of previous decades, in his own church, and insisting that full privileges of the church should only be given to full church members, those who had really professed their Christian faith, as well as helped

pay the bills, with these he found himself in disfavor. And, adding to this, his justified criticism of the questionable moral life of some of the youth of his church, he was forced to resign his pulpit, one of the outstanding ones in influence and wealth in all New England. His resignation resulted in his new charge on the frontier at Stockbridge, Mass., not far from the present city of Pittsfield. There, while ministering to a few whites and the Stockbridge Indians, he had the time to write that great philosophical-theological classic on *The Freedom of the Will*, one of the greatest philosophical classics ever penned by an American."

A.

Parish Education

(PAUL M. LINDBERG in the *Lutheran Companion*)

Parish education is at the very heart of the postwar planning program of the Christian Church. What the Church will be in the critical days ahead depends much on the effectiveness with which it meets the present educational challenge to prepare for that day. Today's Church reflects the sum total result of its own educational program of yesterday. It is the ripe fruit of seed sown and nurtured through that program, and in turn contains the seeds of the Church of tomorrow.

It has long been an accepted principle that the one who holds the youth of the land holds also the nation's future. America has been built on that principle. Totalitarian leaders have caught it at the very beginning of their struggles for power. To lure the youth of the land into their folds they used effectively the strategy of calling them away from traditional Sabbath observances to spend their time rather at the assigned places of pagan indoctrination drill. These leaders learned well the principle that they might well ignore the adult population in order to concentrate on those in whom the future rested. And now, when soon the dust of battle has cleared away, the nations on the side of righteousness and freedom will learn how effectively the enemy has grasped its present; for to wrench out roots set deep in the souls of misled youth will prove more difficult than the task of winning physical battles.

Facing Future in the Present

In sharp contrast to the short vision of a previous world war era the minds of world leaders are desperately at work in laying plans for the peace to come. To a slogan-loving generation, postwar planning has its intriguing aspects. To those who would project themselves out of the reality of the present, it offers a ready escape. But to those who have deep convictions that war is too often won at the expense of the peace to come, there is a realistic facing of the present as the only guarantee for the day to come.

To say that the Church has a postwar job is simply to use new terminology for an old truth. Every generation has a struggle which becomes the birth pains of its own posterity. The Church constantly must wage its own battle for life in the world in order to preserve the very life that it would give to the world.

Vital in this battle has been the Church's educational program.

And in every case the portion of that program that has reached the masses, and especially the children, has been the most effective in laying the broad basis for securing the future. It is the local congregation that carries the burden of this responsibility, for it is there alone that the many can be reached.

Church Holds Message for Future

Can we be sure about the Church's most meaningful contribution to the future? Lack of clear vision slows up the planning process. And while world leaders are groping and sparring to find and give direction to their plans, the Christian Church holds in its trust the message that will show the world the right way ahead. The Church cannot afford to miss the opportunity; it can not afford but to place its supreme energies into its local parish educational program. If this should fail, the future will fail.

The Church stands boldly and confidently with a divine commission to serve in a confused age. Here are some of the things it can do right now:

To ground the future in the knowledge of, and faith in, the omnipotent and merciful God, in whom alone the realization of life must be found.

To establish His Word in the hearts of men as the only norm by which life can be successfully and happily lived.

To lead to a personal commitment to Christ, who saves from sin and gives the mind and the power for a higher level of living.

To set the foundation for a moral reconstruction of man by which alone constant peace can be assured.

To lead in the direction of economic and physical rehabilitation for a war-ravaged world.

To assure a strong Church for its sons and daughters when they return from far-flung posts of war duty.

To be ready for the day when doors will open again over all the earth for the proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and the strengthening of His Kingdom in the hearts of men.

Things That Cannot Wait

Pastors, deacons, Church schoolteachers, parents, leaders! These are the urgencies that face those who are working close to the people. They can not wait another day. The future of the Church is very much in the hands of those who are tending the local parish educational program. But that future is now!

Ad Phil. 2:12

The synergist seems to find support for his error in Phil. 2:12: τὴν ἐαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθε, especially in Luther's translation: *Schaffet, dasz ihr selig werdet, mit Furcht und Zittern*. The fact is, of course, that v. 12 does not treat of conversion or justification, but of sanctification, and v. 13 definitely ascribes everything in the Christian's life, conversion, sanctification, preservation, to the grace of God alone. The usual interpretation of this passage is that we are in grave danger

of losing our salvation through disobedience and must therefore strive with might and main "to make our calling and election sure," 2 Pet. 1:10. See Apology XX and Formula of Concord IV (*Triglotta*, 341.947). On the basis of an article by the Dublin theologian J. Warren, in the *Evangelical Quarterly*, April, 1944, we submit another approach to Phil. 2:12. We quote Warren in part: "Strabo, the ancient Greek geographer, who lived and wrote in the time of Christ, gives us some account of the once famous silver mines of Spain. The Roman imperial exchequer, he states, was then netting out of them a daily revenue of 25,000 drachmae. When he thus refers to the "working out" of these mines, no reader of his supposes for a moment that he is speaking of the Romans' acquiring of them, but of their operating, exploiting, getting the most value they could out of what was already securely in their possession. Why, then, in regard to the Apostolic behest (Phil. 2:12) should so many of us tamely accept the hackneyed unevangelical exposition that Christian believers are committed to some grim, interminable, or at least lifelong, task of achieving or acquiring their personal salvation—in Romish parlance, of making their souls? Surely, the meaning is entirely different. We have here an inspiring clarion call to us to operate, practice, act out, get the full virtue out of, the salvation already bestowed upon each of us by sovereign [?] grace through faith; amply and thoroughly to draw upon, to educe, to bring into play and action, to utilize and exercise, all its spiritual resources, each for the benefit of his brethren as well as of himself, and for the honor and glory of Christ the Savior. For the same Greek term is used in both passages—κατεργάζεσθαι, the verb form of it in the Epistle, and the verbal noun form of it, κατεργασία, in Strabo." The author therefore suggests the following definition of the verb κατεργάζεσθαι: "The 'out' is an adverb, more expressive doubtless of thoroughness than of exteriority, as when we wear out a coat, tire out a horse, burn out a candle. This is certainly the case here where 'out' represents the Greek prefix κατά—so that the antithesis, so favored by some evangelists, between the 'working in' of v.13, and the 'working out' out of v.12 derives no support from the original. Now, every object (be it abstract or concrete or metaphorical) of the verb κατεργάζεσθαι, wherever it occurs in the Epistles, is, it may be fairly claimed, *already in being, not at all waiting to be acquired*, but here and now available or liable to be operated on or with, exercised, drawn out, brought into action, enhanced as to its good or aggravated as to its evil."* Warren supports his definition of the verb by referring to the context. St. Paul warns the Philippians against dissensions and admonishes them to humility in

* According to Kittel, *Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, III, 1. 635 ff., κατεργάζεσθαι in classical Greek denotes both the working and the completing of a task (nieder-arbeiten, ueberwinden, fertig-arbeiten). Cf. LXX, Ex. 35:33; Ps. 67:29. (A. V., Ps. 68:28.) As used by Paul and James in the New Testament the verb denotes the completing of a task, both in *malam* and *bonam partem*. Note especially Eph. 6:13: "having done all." While Kittel does not include Warren's definition of κατεργάζεσθαι, he also emphasizes the fact that the verb definitely conveys the concept of completion.

their various social relations, vv. 2, 14ff. He had cited the example of our Lord's humility and in v. 12 motivates his admonition (δωτε) by reminding them that "they had learned, while he was among them, trustfully and prayerfully to lay hold on, to avail themselves of the sanctifying grace and guidance and strength that flow from reconciliation and fellowship with God into the hearts and lives of those who come to Him through His Son, for the conquest of all fleshly and evil impulses, such as mutual dissension and ill feeling; let them not flag in that constantly needful spiritual exercise." If the author's definition of the verb is correct, then Phil. 2:12 must be interpreted not negatively as a warning, but rather as a positive admonition to make the most of the bliss which we now possess in Christ; then σωτηρία is not to be thought of as the future bliss, but the freedom from sin, the devil, the fear of death, which we possess in Christ Jesus even now. Christians do indeed sit with Christ in heavenly places, Eph. 2:6; they are kings and conquerors; they are united with Christ as branches with the vine and find in Christ an inexhaustible storehouse of spiritual power and untold riches. Cp. Thayer, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, s. v. σωτηρία, σώζεσθαι, salvation as a present possession. Τὴν αὐτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθε, i. e., utilize these resources! F. E. M.

Family Facts

(Pertaining to Russia)

Under the relentless pressure of reality, the Soviet Government has made many adjustments of its primitive theories in the last quarter of a century. High among its early taboos was the "bourgeois institution" of the family. For the family, by its nature, is opposed to that atomization of the populace which is one of the conditions for the smooth functioning of a totalitarian state. It is not just a bit of biological machinery for producing future citizens; it is a society within a society; it has a structure and government of the family, the surest guarantee of the state's welfare.

It will inevitably tend to become conscious of its rights and to assert them—the right to property, for instance, as the condition of its existence and freedom; the right to educate its own members in its own traditions, as the condition of its harmony and continuity. The Christian philosophy of centuries—and the natural philosophy of men in almost every age and time—has seen in the family the real foundation stone of the state, and in the healthy condition of the family the surest guarantee of the welfare of the state.

Having discarded all these beliefs some twenty-five years ago, the rulers of the Soviet are at length beginning to realize that the machine gun and the concentration camp are no stronger than the pitchfork when it comes to throwing out Nature; it always comes back.

From a facility in divorce which out-Renoed Reno, Russia has moved back and has recently tightened the divorce laws even more. The legal fee is quadrupled; it is no longer a sufficient excuse to say that "we can't get on together," and courts are instructed to aim at reconciling the applicants rather than at setting them free.

At the same time, family allowances are made available on the birth of the fourth child rather than the seventh, and benefits to prospective mothers during pregnancy are extended. (It is interesting to note, by the way, that in Russia there seems nothing unusual in having four children.) Medals of honor will be granted to mothers of large families.

Premier Stalin is usually reckoned to be a hard-boiled superrealist; and certainly the above legislation is a recognition—partial, at least—of the superiority of fact to theory. The Premier wants a strong Russia and seems to be finding out the way to what he wants. Is it carping to suggest that a second look at some of the other beliefs jettisoned by the Revolution might bring him to the even more realistic conclusion that the fullest strength is achieved only by a free people? With true freedom of religion, freedom of speech and press, free participation in political decisions, the Russian people can rise to their full stature. No tutelage, however good, can ultimately satisfy a people worthy of freedom.—*America*, July 22, 1944.

Concerning Lutheran Confessions

In the very interesting volume entitled, *First Free Lutheran Diet in America*, which was held in Philadelphia December 27—28, 1877, the third paper deals with "The Four General Bodies of the Lutheran Church in the United States: Wherein they agree, and wherein they might harmoniously co-operate." The reading of this paper was followed by several remarks. The one presented by the Rev. W. J. Mann is worthy of careful study. It reads as follows: "It is understood that silence here must not be misunderstood, otherwise I would feel completely vanquished. It is certain that the Augsburg Confession alone would not have made the Lutheran Church. Luther's Small Catechism has done much more for her practical life. Bro. Rosenmiller uses the Augsburg Confession as a cloak for unionistic indifferentism. The language of the Augsburg Confession is so short and concise that it is often unfairly used for whatever perversions may be desired. It must, of course, be interpreted in the sense in which the authors of the Confession themselves understood it. Anything else is a falsification. What the precise understanding of the Augsburg Confession is, is a point concerning which there can be no doubt. Luther's Catechism preceded the Augsburg Confession. In the sense of the Catechism the Confession is to be understood; otherwise Luther would contradict himself even in public documents. It is doing a great wrong toward him and the Lutheran reformers to place such a sense upon their words, as for instance, in the doctrine of the Holy Supper, as they on every given occasion most strenuously rejected and regarded as heretical. To use the Augsburg Confession as a bond of union for those who seriously differ in their interpretation of it, is consequently totally out of place." P. E. K.
