

Concordia Theological Monthly

Volume 20

Article 37

6-1-1949

Miscellanea

John Theodore Mueller
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

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



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mueller, John Theodore (1949) "Miscellanea," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 20, Article 37.
Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol20/iss1/37>

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 Lutheran Dogmaticians and Modern Barthian Influences

It is perhaps rather late in the season for us to quote at this time the *Australasian Theological Review* (Vol. XIX, Nos. 1—2) of January-June, 1948. However, we are sure that the reader will pardon us for doing this when he is informed that the issue reached us only in the late fall and that the matter which we quote is important not only in 1948, but also in 1949 and far beyond that.

The matter, in brief, concerns the influence of Barthian or Brunnerian theology on present-day Lutheran thinking. This influence is noticeable here in America and, as Dr. H. Hamann shows, also in Australia. Dr. Hamann was occasioned to speak of the Neo-Lutheran tendency (if we may so call it) by an article in the newly founded *Lutheran Quarterly* of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in Australia (A. L. C.) written by its editor, Dr. Siegfried P. Hebart. Dr. Hamann, in his fair, thorough, and scholarly way of judging all things theological, finds in the article much to praise, but also much to censure. The article bears the title "Lutheran Theology Today" and is, as Professor Hamann judges, "not so much a survey of Lutheran theology today as rather a bird's-eye view of Lutheran theology from Luther down to the present time." The subject is treated by Dr. Hebart on fourteen pages of a magazine of small format, and therefore the author "should have been doubly and trebly on his guard against the danger that lurks in generalizations. As it stands or as it reads, the article as a whole has a most unhappy effect. A reader not well acquainted with the history and the teachings of the Lutheran Church will probably be led to believe that Lutheran theology, directly after Luther, blundered from error to error, from aberration to aberration, until genuine Lutheran theology reappeared in Karl Barth!"

Dr. Hamann then writes: "Coming to details, we must deprecate the treatment meted out to the great Lutheran dogmaticians of the sixteenth and seventeenth century. Let a man dislike their method, their classifications, their distinctions, their endless *causae* as much as he pleases: that gives him no right to challenge the Biblical character and the truth of their teachings. Dr. Hebart does not point to a single error in *teaching*, as far as we have been able to see, on the part of these men. Yet while not only Luther, but also Calvin, is credited with a 'Christocentric and theocentric approach'—this in spite of the rationalism which Calvin displays again and again in his man-made system!—that approach was forgotten 'for many centuries,' it appears, by Lutheran theology (p. 5). But when Dr. Hebart charges the dogmaticians with an 'anthropocentric' approach, he should have pointed out that the meaning of this term must in their case be quite different from what

it signifies in reference to the men of the Renaissance with their purely pagan outlook. A theology that sets forth faithfully the thoughts of God as revealed in His Word can never be fitly and justly stigmatized as 'anthropocentric.' But why bother with such learned labels at all? If the true object of true theology is 'to save thyself and them that hear thee' (1 Tim. 4:16), then theology must be in a certain sense, though not in the sense in which Dr. Hebart uses the term, anthropocentric! We find a similar loose application of terms, which inevitably results in a wrong picture, when our author again and again accuses the dogmaticians of surrendering to scholasticism, philosophy, Aristotelianism (pp. 5, 6). To compare Luther's strong words on Aristotle with the prevalence of Aristotelian thought in the dogmaticians results in a false antithesis. Luther's ire was directed against a church that had virtually made of Aristotle a *principium cognoscendi* and used his writings to bolster up its wrong theology. The dogmaticians operated with Aristotelian logic, because that happened to be the only formal logic then known to the world, even as our logical formulations still go back, willy-nilly, to that ancient source. But Dr. Hebart offers no proof that the doctrinal statements of the dogmaticians were corrupted by the methods which they used. Assertion is not proof."

Dr. Hamann next shows by an example how the Lutheran dogmaticians are faulted by Dr. Hebart for defining God as the *summum ens, actus purus, ens spirituale, ens simplicissimum*, and he defends them by saying: "Well, we reproduce these horrid terms when we speak of God as the Supreme Being, *das hoechste Wesen*; and the only fault which a reasonable man can find with these English and German terms is that they are insufficient to define the true God." Lack of space prevents us from offering Dr. Hamann's further discussion of the subject, which closes with the significant thought that had not Dr. Hebart in a single line spoken of "the real faith which the Orthodox theologians undoubtedly had," the non-Lutheran theologian, reading the article, would no doubt have gained a most unfavorable, negative impression of these eager defenders of Lutheran theology. So far Dr. Hamann's criticism of Dr. Hebart's attack on the Orthodox Lutheran dogmaticians' presentation of the doctrine of God.

Dr. Hebart, however, criticizes the Orthodox Lutheran dogmaticians also for wrongly representing the Biblical doctrine of divine revelation. He writes, as quoted by Dr. Hamann: "The detrimental tendency, however, was to emphasize the correct theory and not the dynamic fact of revelation which gave birth to that theory. The orthodox dogmatic phraseology is the thing; the compelling logic of an Aristotelian system becomes as important as the living Word of God." Dr. Hamann dismisses this unjust attack on our Lutheran Church teachers of the seventeenth century with the brief remark that "the picture painted in the quotation and in the following sentences is quite wrong." To us personally, however, Dr. Hebart's statement seems to be downright untrue.

Any one who has really studied our dogmaticians knows that they had to defend the doctrine of Scripture concerning itself, in particular, the doctrine of divine inspiration, against Unitarian and other forms of liberalism. But they defended the divine authority and efficacy of Scripture no less than its divine inspiration and inerrancy.

It is highly significant that Dr. Hamann next remarks: "When reading the two pages devoted to the errorist Karl Barth, we note in general that he is praised as roundly, in spite of some mild and formal censure, as the orthodox dogmaticians have been thoroughly trounced in spite of their orthodoxy—which means right belief and therefore right teaching." We can well understand this high praise of Barth in Dr. Hebart's article, for we find it also in articles written by Lutheran theologians in America who criticize our dogmaticians after the fashion of Dr. Hebart. From what Dr. Hamann quotes from the article it is indeed largely influenced by Barthian liberalism. We agree fully with our Australian colleague when he writes: "If it is true that Barth's 'influence has been the greatest of all influences on Lutheran theology today (p. 14),' we can only hope that this influence, apart from the stimulus which it may give to the study of Luther, will speedily come to an end."

The importance of Dr. Hamann's article lies in its masterly defense of our Lutheran teachers against attacks that are as untrue as they are dangerous. In the last analysis the present-day attacks upon Lutheran orthodoxy by liberals are focused on the defense by our teachers of the plenary inspiration of Scripture. Barthianism has suggested to modern theologians a new conception of revelation. Misled by Barth's unscriptural teachings, these theologians now declare that after all only the incarnate Word—Christ—matters, and not the Scriptures which testify of Christ. They do not identify Scripture with the Word of God in the sense that the Bible is the Word of God, and so champion a sort of vicious enthusiasm which is bound to destroy not only the divine Bible, but also the divine Christ, the Savior of sinners. We suggest to our readers a careful study of our Lutheran dogmaticians at this time and recommend as a very suitable ministerial gift the ever stimulating and helpful quarterly of our brethren in Australia—the *Australasian Theological Review*.
J. T. M.

Recent Trends in New Testament Study

Under this heading, Prof. William Hendriksen, professor of New Testament at Calvin Seminary, Grand Rapids, Mich., suggests in the *Calvin Forum* (October, 1948) the work which believing, Christian New Testament scholars must do in the near future to supply the needs in their vast and important field. There is need, first of all, of a new dictionary of New Testament Greek which utilizes the papyri and the LXX, as G. E. Wright of McCormick Theological Seminary recently emphasized. But how can there be a New Testament lexicon which utilizes the LXX as long as we

are still waiting for an adequate dictionary of the LXX? Nothing that approaches completeness has ever been produced in this area. Again, there remains the question as to what extent the papyri material can be legitimately used to shed light on New Testament terms and constructions. At present there is no agreement on this issue. But as long as the relative significance of papyri material for New Testament lexicography and grammar is still the subject of fierce contention, it will be useless to look for a really good New Testament lexicon. In connection with this subject the writer points out the need of a book of New Testament synonyms. The work of R. C. Trench is now being republished, but that book was written seventy years ago and will hardly suffice today. The synonym book must be more complete than is Trench, and, besides, it should incorporate the results of later lexicographical studies.

But needed still more than the works just named are new commentaries and translations of the New Testament. The older commentaries, of which now some are being republished, cannot fully satisfy the present-day needs, since they naturally do not take cognizance of whatever advance there has been in textual criticism, archaeology, lexicography, and related studies. A commentary on the New Testament which satisfies these demands is long overdue. Again, while versions of the New Testament are appearing so fast that one can hardly keep up with them, of which much can be said on the favorable side, it is doubtful that any one is generally satisfactory, and one still hears the demand for a true and faithful version of the New Testament made by conservative scholars.

In the field of New Testament Introduction the need of a new work is particularly great, for as yet not one has appeared that combines the following musts: a. It must be alive with respect to the trends in New Testament study, discussing present-day issues from a conservative point of view; b. It must devote ample space to the discussion of the actual contents of the New Testament as a whole and of its several books; c. It must present its themes, outlines, and other materials in such a manner that these can be rather easily retained by the student. Recently published New Testament Introductions may be grouped as follows: a. Such as are radical or liberal; b. Such as are falsely called conservative, since they are under Barthian influence and deny that the entire Bible, as originally written, is the inspired Word of God; and c. Such as are wholly sound in principle and excellent in many of their features, but are lacking in distinctive methodology. The new, badly needed New Testament Introduction must possess the advantages of true scholarship, a distinctive methodology, and soundness of doctrine.

Greatly needed, moreover, are new conservative works in the field of New Testament History and Biblical Theology. Books in this area, as the author says, are appearing faster than any one can read them, for Paul is being "recovered" right along. But the very Apostle who defends the true and well-balanced religion

against such extremes as ecstatic emotionalism, dogmatic intellectualism, humanitarian philanthropism, and all-out asceticism (cf. 1 Corinthians 13) has been called the advocate of each of these in turn. The writer says: "Most of the nineteenth century reconstructions of Pauline teaching have characterized him as a dogmatist, the creator of a philosophy of religion. Of late there have been several reactions, but on the whole they have not been of the right variety. As to the 'life' and teaching of Christ, Form Criticism is the vogue today. It is a historical reconstruction of the pre-Gospel writing period, or rather, an attempt to arrive at such a reconstruction. The material of which the Gospels are made is divided into several distinct units, types, or forms, such as miracle-stories, sayings of Jesus, apocalyptic sayings, and so forth. These separate units are then divested of whatever the Form Critic regards as extraneous material, that is, material that was added to the original form. The theories of many of these Form Critics are subjective in the extreme. They believe that miracle-stories must be late, for the simple reason that miracles could not have happened. Often the presupposition, whether expressed or implied, is of this character: the Gospel stories are nothing but folk tales that have grown by gradual accretion, as a rolling snow ball. Early preachers took the 'forms' as they found them and added or subtracted—usually added—to suit their purpose. These advocates of Form Criticism fail completely to explain how such a mighty and glorious movement as Christianity could have developed from such a false start. It is too bad for the theory that the critics themselves differ so widely on so many basic points. The whole spectacle would be amusing if it were not so serious."

Dr. Hendriksen closes his article with the words: "The Reformed scholar, who takes his stand upon the sure foundation of the Word of God, has a mountain of work ahead of him. Even when you and I limit ourselves to the writing of the most essential books, such as will be in the nature of tools for further research, this task will require years of patient toil. Scores of men must be engaged in it. It is, however, work that must be accomplished. It must be done for the sake of God and His kingdom, in order that the glorious work of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ may stand out more clearly than ever, and in order that the Church which He founded may cause its light to shine more brilliantly in this sin-darkened world."

There is doubtlessly not a single Lutheran scholar who does not agree with this earnest Reformed professor. Tremendous questions, however, confront us. How can Lutheran conservative scholarship be made available for the work which Professor Hendriksen so well outlines? Is our Church willing to spend the large sums of money which are needed for this work, and is it willing to prepare the scholars that can do it? Someday these problems must be faced. And that day is today.

J. T. M.

A Plea for the *Historia Lutheranismi*

This article is a frank appeal for the proper appreciation and preservation of Veit Ludwig von Seckendorf's famous history of the Lutheran Reformation. *Historia Lutheranismi* is the abbreviated title of his monumental *Commentarius historicus et apologeticus de Lutherismo*, of which the final edition appeared more than two and a half centuries ago.¹ This stupendous work will probably never be republished; hence every copy of it still extant should be guarded with utmost care. Translations and abridgments can be found more frequently; but also these deserve the solicitous care of their owners. For many facts regarding the origin and the growth of the Lutheran Church the *Historia* or *Commentarius* has become the oldest source of information. Since many of the original records have been destroyed, their reproductions in the *Historia* have become primary materials for the historian. The importance of the *Historia* for the student of Reformation history can scarcely be exaggerated. References to and quotations from it in other works would fill many folios. It has been used by both friends and foes of the Reformation, and both have admitted its general excellence. Seckendorf himself has given us the history of his *Commentarius*;² the various translations and abridgments give their own.

The first book of the *Commentarius* appeared as a separate volume in 1688. When he wrote this book, Seckendorf had received only a small part of the manuscript documents which had been promised him from the archives of the princes. The quotations, however, from the documents which he had met with such a favorable response that he was encouraged to proceed with the work. Many now sent him certain manuscripts and published materials which had virtually been lost. Thus encouraged, Seckendorf himself visited the Saxon archives at Weimar in September, 1688, where an immense number of the acts of the Ernestine electors of Saxony was preserved. The baron gives special credit to Tobias Pfanner, the erudite Saxon chancellor, who, being in charge of the archives, was his guide through "that vast forest of volumes," so that he could select more easily what he believed to be necessary. Later, says Seckendorf, through the singular indulgence of the most serene dukes of Saxony more than 420 volumes were sent to him as requested, in which were contained the acts in the cause of religion of the elector princes of Saxony and its allies with the emperors, kings, princes, and other noblemen and cities, and with the theologians, also with those within the province itself. In these volumes he found many things which pertained to the history of the seven

¹ Vitus Ludovicus a Seckendorf, *Commentarius historicus et apologeticus de Lutherismo, sive de reformatione religionis ductu D. Martini Lutheri in magna Germaniae parte aliisque regionibus, & speciatim in Saxoniam recepta & stabilita* (2d ed.; Lipsiae: Sumtibus Jo. Friderici Gleditschii, 1694).

² In the "Ad Lectorem Admonitio" of the 1692 and 1694 editions.

years already treated in the first book. He also received certain items from other libraries, public and private, or written records pertaining to those years. Owing to the acquisition of all these additional materials, he considered it necessary to add a supplement to the first book. He published one in 1689, smaller in form, and in it obligated himself to continue the work. But finding more documents in the archives from day to day than he had included in this supplement and having received still more from other places, he deemed it advisable to prepare an enlarged edition of the first book. He was greatly encouraged when, in 1690, in response to a German prospectus of his work a large number of the enlarged edition was requested in advance for distribution in the parishes. A part, also, of the cost of printing was paid him in advance. Since not as many copies of the first book, printed in 1688 in quarto, were left as were requested, and since the remaining part of the work could not be compressed into one volume of that size, it was now decided to publish the entire work in a folio volume.

The first edition of the complete work in folio bears the date of publication 1692. Perhaps owing to the orders for various parishes noted above, this edition was sold out so rapidly that a new one had to be published. This bears the date of 1694. It differs very little from the first edition. The catalog of *errata* in the first edition could, of course, be eliminated by the printer in the second. Seckendorf having died before the second edition went to press, the publisher could with good grace insert the author's picture as a frontispiece to Book I. In all other respects the two editions are almost exactly alike, even the pagination is identical, so that it is quite feasible to quote from either edition without indicating which one is being used. The three books of the folio editions contain 1,238 pages, not including the "Ad Lectorem Admonitio" and the "Praeloquium." Like these, the copious indexes also have no page numbering. The "Admonitio" and the "Praeloquium" add forty, the three indexes 115 pages to the book. The sum total of folios constitutes a truly prodigious work. The *Commentarius* was written in Latin, the language of the chancellories at that time. Seckendorf had been a chancellor. Furthermore, this work was written primarily for scholars.

Impressed with the importance of Seckendorf's *Commentarius*, various writers undertook the task of making this work accessible to a larger circle of readers by reducing its volume and translating it into the vernacular. The first to attempt this was Wilhelm Ernst Tentzel. Seckendorf himself had begun to translate the *Commentarius* into German; but since the baron's death intervened before the work had progressed very far, Tentzel, in 1695, promised to publish a German history of Lutheranism which was to consist of three parts. The first was to cover the period to Luther's death, the second to the year 1600, and the third to his own time. He also published a prospectus of such a work in 1697 and hoped to begin

the following year. His plans, too, were frustrated by death in 1707. E. S. Cyprian published Tenzel's work with his own additions ten years later.³ This work is valuable because it clears up some passages in the *Commentarius* which are seemingly contradictory or reveal that Seckendorf lacked adequate information on some specific topic.

Upon Tenzel's death, Elias Frick undertook the task of putting out a German version. He did not consider it useful, he explains in the "Vorrede," to translate Louis Maimbourg's history, which Seckendorf had translated from French into Latin and included in the *Commentarius* for refutation, but merely noted the Jesuit's alleged errors by the way. Seckendorf's *Commentarius* had been written in reply to Maimbourg's popular history of Lutheranism, published in Paris, 1680.⁴ Accordingly it was not necessary, says Frick, to follow the frequently faulty order in which Maimbourg arranged his materials, as Seckendorf did. Frick divided the materials in Seckendorf's third book into two books, since this book is larger than the first and the second combined. He treats in order the decisions of the diets and conventions in religious matters, Luther's Reformation writings, the progress of the Reformation in various countries and cities, and the religious persecutions. He placed the contents of Seckendorf's *additiones* in their proper connection and year. Seckendorf's own opinions were condensed by the translator, also the extensive register and reviews of Luther's writings; but his important *reflexiones* and the reports taken from the archives were carefully retained. Unfortunately Frick took the liberty to add certain modifiers here and there which have a tendency to sharpen Seckendorf's criticism of others. Frick's version appeared in 1714.⁵

Because the *Commentarius* was written in Latin and Frick's version, which was too voluminous for the average reader, says Benjamin Lindner, had become quite rare and rather expensive, Court Councilor Christian Friedrich Junius of Saxe-Koburg-Saalfeld decided to publish a new abridged German version of the *Commentarius*. Junius died before he could give his work its final revision, but he pledged his friend Lindner to attend to its publication. Lindner did this, but recast the entire work, dropping Secken-

³ Wilhelm Ernst Tenzel, *Historischer Bericht vom Anfang und ersten Fortgang der Reformation Lutheri, zur Erlaeuterung des Hn. v. Seckendorff Historie des Lutherthums, mit grossem Fleiss erstattet, und nunmehr in diesem andern Evangelischen Jubel-Jahr, nebst einer besondern Vorrede, auch nuetzlichen noch nie mahls publicirten Uhrkunden, und noethigen Registern mitgetheilet* (Leipzig: bey Joh. Ludwig Gleditsch und Moritz Georg Weidmann, 1718).

⁴ Louis Maimbourg, *Histoire du Luthéranisme* (2 vols.; Imprimée à Paris, 1680).

⁵ Elias Frick (trans. and ed.), *Veit Ludwig von Seckendorf, Ausfuehrliche Historie des Lutherthums und der heilsamen Reformation, welche der theure Martin Luther binnen dreyzig Jahren gluecklich ausgefuehret* (Leipzig: Joh. Friedrich Gleditsch und Sohn, 1714).

dorf's arrangement, which had been retained by Junius, and reducing the work to a more continuous narrative. The foreword to the first two parts is dated August 31, 1754. Less than four weeks later, September 24, Lindner died, and a friend, Superintendent G. E. Gruendler, attended to the publication of Parts Three and Four. The popularity of this work is attested by the fact that the stereotype edition published by A. Schlitt in Baltimore in 1865 was made possible by hundreds of subscribers in a dozen States, ranging from New York to Missouri and from Minnesota to Louisiana.⁶

Junius' work, appearing in five octavos, was still too voluminous and costly for the average reader, according to Johann Friedrich Roos, so the latter, in 1781, published a compendium of it in two volumes.⁷ This work was soon completely sold out. Roos now decided to publish a still more abridged German version taken directly out of the *Commentarius*, without making any use of Junius' work whatsoever. The author's father, Councilor Magnus Friedrich Roos, wrote the foreword.⁸ It would be difficult to find more convincing proofs of Seckendorf's value to students of Reformation history than these repeated abridgments and versions of his *Commentarius*. Each abridgment, moreover, evidences a desire to appeal to a larger circle of readers than was reached by the previous more voluminous works.

But in another way these abridgments paved the way for a larger circle of Seckendorf readers. Roos's first edition was translated into French by Jean Jacques Paur (*sic*) and published at Basle in 1784.⁹ Melchior Kirchhofer in his biography of William Farel cites an "Abrégé françois de Seckendorf, par le Pasteur J. J. Pont."¹⁰ Without giving any further details, Schreber reports that the *Historia Lutheranismi* was translated into the "Belgian" (*sic*) language in 1727 and published at Amsterdam.¹¹ Nicéron

⁶ Benjamin Lindner (ed.), *Christian Friederich Junii kurzgefasste Reformations-Geschichte, aus des Hrn. Veit Ludwigs von Seckendorf Historia Lutheranismi, zur allgemeinen Erbauung zusammen gezogen, mit einem Anhang vom Jahre 1546 bis zum Religionsfrieden 1555 vermehrt und mit einer Vorrede herausgegeben* (Baltimore: A. Schlitt, 1865).

⁷ *Reformations-Geschichte in einem verbesserten Auszug des Herrn Christian Friederich Junius aus des Herrn Veit Ludwigs von Seckendorf Historia Lutheranismi herausgegeben und mit Anmerkungen versehen* (Tuebingen: bei Ludwig Friedrich Fues, 1781—1782).

⁸ *Reformations-Geschichte in einem Auszug aus Veit Ludwig von Seckendorf Historia Lutheranismi mit Anmerkungen* (2d ed.; Tuebingen: Gedruckt mit Fuesischen Schriften, 1788).

⁹ "Seckendorf," *Nouvelle biographie universelle*, Vol. XLIII.

¹⁰ *Das Leben Wilhelm Farel's, aus den Quellen bearbeitet* (2 vols.; Zurich: bey Orell, Fuessli und Compagnie, 1831—1833), I, 48.

¹¹ Dan. Godofredo Schreberus, *Historia vitae ac meritorum perillustri quondam domini, Domini Viti Ludovici a Seckendorff* (Prostat Lipsiae in Officina Brauniana, 1734), p. 135.

may refer to this same version when he observes: "Die Hollaender haben es in ihre Sprache uebersetzen lassen," for he seems to have followed Schreberus in his discussion of Seckendorf's works.¹² But though Schreberus asserts: "Apud Anglos quoque tantum semper valuerit, quantum apud Lutheranos," citing Burnet, the historian, in support of this statement, it does not appear that the *Commentarius* was ever translated into English. At any rate, Bayard Quincy Morgan does not mention such a translation in his *Critical Bibliography of German Literature in English Translation, 1481—1927*.¹³ The *Commentarius*, however, soon found its way into England. Burnet speaks of "the often-cited Seckendorf,"¹⁴ and this at a time when he was in correspondence with him.¹⁵ So the *Commentarius* must have come to the attention of the erudite Englishman almost immediately. This is also apparent from the fact that the translator of Sleidan's history into English quoted Seckendorf's *Commentarius* as early as 1689.¹⁶ How the Latin language speeded scholarly works across international borders!

From what has been said it is evident that not all editions of the *Commentarius*, or *Historia Lutheranismi*, are of equal value. Obviously the original editions of 1692 and 1694 rank first in order of their importance. Next in order would come Frick's translation, then Junius' abridgment, finally Roos's second edition and then his first. The French versions do not seem to be represented in this country. Perhaps some may have escaped the ravages of war and other calamities in Europe. But Lutheran works were not popular in French-speaking countries towards the close of the seventeenth and the greater part of the eighteenth centuries. Should the reader of this article be the fortunate possessor of any edition of Seckendorf's *Commentarius*, he will render scholarship in general and Lutheranism in particular a real service by taking the necessary steps to preserve it. A reputable college, university, or seminary library is perhaps the safest and most profitable depository.

L. W. SPITZ

¹² Friedrich Eberhard Rambach (ed.), *Johan Peter Nicerons Nachrichten von den Begebenheiten und Schriften beruemter Gelehrten mit einigen Zusatzen herausgegeben* (Halle: Verlag und Druck Christoph Peter Franckens, 1758), XVII, 347.

¹³ *A Critical Bibliography of German Literature in English Translation, 1481—1927. With Supplement Embracing the Years 1928—1935* (2d. Ed.; Stanford University: Stanford University Press, 1938).

¹⁴ *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England* (7 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1865), III, 286.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 304.

¹⁶ *The General History of the Reformation of the Church from the Errors & Corruptions of the Church of Rome: Begun in Germany by Martin Luther, with the Progress thereof in All Parts of Christendom, from the Year 1517, to the Year 1556. Written in Latin by John Sleidan, L.L.D. and Faithfully Englished. To Which Is Added, a Continuation to the End of the Council of Trent, in the Year 1562. By Edmund Bohun, Esq.* (London: Edw. Jones, 1689), "An Account of the Author's Life."

Stonewall Jackson's Sunday School

Under this heading Mr. Warren A. Reeder, Jr., a diligent student of the life and work of General Thomas Jonathan Jackson, commonly known as "Stonewall" Jackson, in the *Sunday School Times* (February 19, 1949) writes very interestingly about the Sunday school for Negroes which this outstanding modern strategist had founded at Lexington, Va., while he was professor at the Virginia Military Institute. General Jackson was born in Clarksburg, Va., on January 21, 1824, and died at Guinea Station, Va., on May 10, 1863, from wounds inflicted upon him by his own men who in the darkness of the night had regarded him and his reconnaissance party as enemies. When Jackson died, General Robert E. Lee declared that he had lost his right arm. His pastor at Lexington, Va., said that he had lost not only a consistent, active church member, but also the best deacon he ever saw. After the battle of Bull Run, in 1861, the people at Lexington were eagerly awaiting news concerning its outcome when one day Dr. W. G. White, pastor of the Presbyterian church of which Jackson was a member, received a letter from the General containing no news whatever of the battle, but the following rather insignificant note: "In my tent last night, after a fatiguing day's service, I remembered that I had failed to send my contribution to our colored Sunday school. Enclosed you will find my check for that object, which please acknowledge at your earliest convenience and oblige. Yours faithfully, T. J. Jackson."

General Jackson, as Mr. Reeder writes, was perhaps the foremost of the Christian generals serving at that time with, or under, General Lee. He mentions as others J. E. B. Stuart, Richard S. Ewell, and Daniel Harvey Hill. Their beliefs were so openly professed and consistently practiced that for thirty or forty years after the Civil War it was not unusual to find pastors throughout the South who had formerly been members of the Army of Northern Virginia. Jackson began his Sunday school for Negroes, after he had joined Dr. White's church, as a manifestation of his gratitude toward God and an expression of his faith. There were at that time no Negro churches in Lexington, and so Jackson's special Sunday school for Negroes was launched in autumn 1855, when he was thirty-one years old. There were twelve teachers recruited from the educated Christian gentry, and the peak attendance was about a hundred. Mrs. Jackson joined her husband in the work. The school began at three o'clock on Sunday afternoons and lasted exactly forty-five minutes. The order of service was simple: singing, prayer, exposition of the assigned passage of Scripture, which Professor Jackson himself conducted, class sessions, reassembly, memorizing of hymns, and the dismissal prayer. Once a month Jackson gave a personal report on the behavior and punctuality of each of the pupils, calling at their homes. Every absence or inattentiveness was carefully inquired into. Tardiness was stopped by a simple method; at three o'clock

the doors were closed, and no more pupils or teachers were admitted. In addition to his Sunday school work, Jackson also carried on volunteer Christian work as a deacon of his church. Once when he collected for the American Bible Society, he made a one hundred per cent record, soliciting funds not only among the members of his church, but also among his Negro friends. Every Saturday night was devoted by General and Mrs. Jackson to the study of the Sunday school lesson. Before leaving his house, he knelt in prayer for the work. When the Civil War broke out, the news was brought to him on a Saturday. He told his wife: "Let us dismiss all thoughts of war." That very night they studied the Sunday school lesson for the last time, for at three o'clock the next day he was on the march in response to a sudden call to service. The lesson was never taught, but during the war Jackson constantly sought for reports on his Sunday school, declaring that it was one of his great privations to be absent from it. After Jackson's death and burial the Union Army swept through Lexington and devastated certain portions of it. The Confederate flag on his grave was taken down by friends and concealed, but one of his colored Sunday school pupils pinned a hymn verse to a miniature flag and placed it on the General's grave as a tribute to his beloved superintendent. After the war the Sunday school was continued to the middle or latter part of the 90's, when Negro churches were established in Lexington and Jackson's Sunday school was no longer necessary. It was served for a long time after Jackson's death by Colonel John T. L. Preston of the Virginia Military Institute, who acted as its superintendent. Jackson's Sunday school at Lexington was not the only one established by Caucasian Christians for the benefit of the Negroes. Such schools existed in many places, and Jackson's, therefore, was not an innovation. Jackson's Christian example might be used to arouse greater interest in personal Sunday school work among our Lutheran laymen.

J. T. M.

The Christian Understanding of History

The American Historical Review for January, 1949, publishes the presidential address delivered at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association in Washington on December 29, 1948, by Kenneth Scott Latourette, professor of missions and Oriental history in Yale University. The subject is "The Christian Understanding of History."

Professor Latourette develops his theme from the Christian's understanding of God. He points out that individual concepts, such as the Kingdom of God, vary also amongst Christians. The sovereignty of God and the free will of man are prominent in his thinking. Notable for the Lutheran reader, however, is Dr. Latourette's vigorous expression of the centrality of Jesus and His crucifixion, the love of God, and the work of the Holy Spirit and the Church, in the way in which Christians see history and make

history. "Here are frankly a perspective and a set of values which are the complete reverse of those which mankind generally esteems." Furthermore, "The rise and fall of cultures and empires are important in so far as they affect individuals, but the rise and fall may harm the individual no more than do the cultures and empires themselves. . . . Christians must always challenge any civilization in which they are set. Yet they are not to be primarily destructive but constructive. They are to be 'the salt of the earth' and 'the light of the world.'"

Professor Latourette develops also other concepts: the Christian's dealing with revelation and with records, his view of existence beyond history, and the influence of the redeeming love of God in Jesus upon our world today. The perplexity caused by the existence of evil alongside of the good the author resolves in the "degree of freedom of man's will, sufficient for man to accept or reject God's love."

This address is noteworthy because of its unusual theme. Historians have not been ready to grant that any specific belief of one of their number could add to his understanding of history; in fact, it might be expected to subtract. Dr. Latourette is unabashed in stressing the fruitfulness of the Christian insight into history.

Even more significant to this reader is the fact that a great historian in the outstanding historians' meeting of the year should give so clean-cut a statement of the primacy of Jesus in the history of man. The speaker's words had weight because in his own tremendous accomplishments he has shown the worth and dependability of his craftsmanship. This is indeed a splendid demonstration of a man being thoroughly Christian in his calling.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

Counsel Them

"Is there a dictator in your life? Are you that dictator? Or are you honestly trying to guide people into making right choices?" Questions like these were uppermost in the minds of a group of Lutheran campus pastors assembled in Chicago, January 19 and 20. "Guidance is a process which begins at conception by which we lead people into a better understanding of themselves and their environment," says Dr. Arthur Manske, Guidance Counselor of Western Michigan College of Kalamazoo. "We must not tell people what to do. We can't say to them, 'This is it.' We can do that only in our own life. In that alone we have the unquestioned authority to make the final decision." What is guidance? We can look at the process this way. First, we can determine the boundaries of the problems which face the individual. We can help him define what is in the picture and what should be brought into focus. Second, we can analyze each factor in a problem. When a person comes with a religious problem relating to the doctrine of God, we need to determine just what it is he cannot accept. In the

process of analysis each point must be taken up and examined from the other fellow's point of view. Perhaps much that belongs to the doctrine of God is strange to him. He hasn't had enough experience to comprehend all of the relationships implied in the problem. As much of the available evidence as is necessary to get a clear picture must be looked at and analyzed objectively. Third, we must help each individual understand his problem. Too many problems remain problems because the questions "What's it all about?" "What's the score?" are left unanswered. But bringing about an understanding is still a long way from telling the individual what to do. The making of a choice or a decision is still up to the individual. He must take the full responsibility.

Church people are looking to pastors for guidance. Too often many have not gone to a minister with a problem because they are afraid they will be "bawled out" for doing something wrong. There are those who feel that a minister won't understand them because he lives in a different world (and often he does, too!). Those who do go, sometimes come away dissatisfied, because the real heart of the problem was not reached. Some ministers come up with a ready-made plan and insist that people follow it to the letter. A pastor who has learned the technique of counseling must remember that he has not found the cure-all. Some people are looking for an escape from making decisions. They love to spin a fine long yarn about their troubles. This helps them put off a decision. In spite of this a clergyman must offer his counsel and aid to all parishioners. He dare not limit his endeavors to spiritual and religious problems. In the guidance activity he can be "all things to all men . . . to save some," as St. Paul suggests.

Now to discover the areas in which people need help.

Interests need to be checked. It is generally accepted that 85 per cent of the American people are unhappily employed. They are working at the wrong job. Either it was the only opening available, or it offered the most money at the time. So very many people are depriving themselves of the joy that comes with actually liking a job and doing it well. Only a pastor who lives with his people can help them find their real interests. He can suggest that they analyze their job and their interest for it. He can also ask, "What do you really like to do?" He can suggest exploring job possibilities suggested by the newly uncovered interests. But again he must lead them into doing the exploring themselves.

There is a more important reason for living with people and finding out their real interests. A pastor must, by the very nature of his position, address a congregation at least once a week. His subject is how religion can profitably be applied to everyday living. Pastors are often too far removed from the people to whom they speak. Their experiences have not been the same, their education has differed, their very mode of life has been conducted on different planes. Some pastors have permitted their people effectively to seal them off from their real thoughts, motives, and actions. This can be seen in the reactions that people give to sermons on many

occasions. The sermons are said to be uninteresting because they do not touch on the real interests and problems that people have. This condition has become the general practice among people to such an extent that it reflects itself in their reaction to any minister. When one walks into a group as a stranger, one can immediately sense it. Conversation comes easy, is relaxed. People say what comes to mind. Then it is revealed that one among them is a minister. Conversationalists freeze. Some people do a quick "double take." "What did I say?" goes through their mind. It takes a "heap o' 'livin'" with people to remove their tensions and get at their real interests.

Another area! *Abilities* should be evaluated. Few if any of us work up to full capacity, the psychologists say. Put it another way, we don't know our own strength. So many of us pastors and laymen fritter away our time and our God-given abilities. To call attention to this wastefulness, a pastor must sometimes interpret an I. Q. to a student to show him the unused portion of his ability. Sometimes defeatism can be counteracted by supplying or laying bare some motivation or drive that will cause the person to develop his ability. When he begins to develop, he gains further initiative just from doing the things he can. Too many college graduates are mediocre people because they have not learned to go all out. If they have been educated for mediocrity, how can they become leaders. The "get-by-as-easy-as-I-can" attitude has become too deeply rooted. Leadership does not grow from the roots of wasted abilities.

Aptitudes offer another challenge. Too many people carry all their eggs in one basket. They can do only one thing and are interested in only one thing. Their personality becomes thin and drab. They do not know what lies beyond their own doorstep. It is a challenge to the counselor to widen their horizons. Many are not willing to try new things to see whether they can do them. They are afraid of failure, afraid that someone will laugh at them. Many aptitudes go undiscovered because we make it too difficult for someone to try out something. Hobbies offer a fine outlet to new aptitudes. A clerk in a paint and wallpaper store tried oil painting when no customers were around. He rigged an easel in a back room for this work. He placed a mirror in such a position that he could easily see anyone coming in the front door. Today he realizes much more money from the oil paintings he does as a hobby than he does from the sale of paint and wallpaper.

Limitations should be recognized. A counselor finds many strange situations in the lives of people. There are some people who take the statement that anyone can become president literally. They will be unhappy all of their lives because they will never be able to reach their life's ambition. We have also complicated the lives of some people unduly because we have put a premium on certain occupations and professions. We have left the impression that though work is honorable it is better to do it in a white collar.

There are certain abilities and aptitudes that will not carry

some people very far in certain jobs and professions. This must be recognized by the counselor. He must try to get the counselee to accept that too. Then there is room to implant the idea that some individuals are not fitted for some jobs but that they are for others. When the counselee recognizes that, he will have avoided an area which brings much heartache. We need to recognize that all of us have physical limitations. Few of us have the physical stamina to climb into the ring and take the offerings of Joe Louis. In the same way we face mental, emotional, and social limitations. When we recognize that, we become more tolerant of the other fellow and his problems.

Opportunities are available for all of us. Again, we must analyze what our opportunities are. There are those who have lamented that there are no more worlds to conquer and those who find acres of diamonds in their own back yards. In the Church the clergy sometimes laments that it is overworked. At the same time laymen are saying, "Please let us work." Certainly here is an opportunity to solve two problems with one stroke. People need to have their eyes opened to all the opportunities around them.

Finally, problems should be solved and needs met. One of the greatest difficulties in the business is to get people to trust the counselor with a problem. Yes, even to talk to him about it. There is no end of problems. With one out of every three marriages ending in divorce, there must be no end of family and marital problems that should be aired somewhere besides in the divorce court. Then there are the problems of sex, family budget, community living, social strata, and many others.

To get people to confide their troubles, they must have confidence in the counselor. Confidence that he will not tattle all he knows to all comers. They must know that he will be a good listener. That he will condemn the sin but not the sinner. They must honestly feel that he will do all in his power to help them see the problem, help them define the problem, analyze it, and finally understand it. But he will not try to push the counselee or tell him what to do in a cut-and-dried answer, a cure-all for all his problems and ills.

While the above is rather general in its nature, it is hoped the parish pastor and institutional worker will find in it some helpful suggestions.

Iowa City, Iowa

JOHN F. CHOITZ

Euthanasia or Mercy Killing

BY A. M. REHWINKEL

The word *euthanasia* is derived from two Greek words—*eu*, which means well, good, pleasant; and *thanatos*, meaning death. Euthanasia therefore means an easy, pleasant death. The more common term for the same idea is "mercy killing."

It is called euthanasia or mercy killing because proponents of the idea advocate that people who suffer from an incurable

and painful disease like cancer, who are feeble-minded or have become senile, or whose life has permanently ceased either to be agreeable or useful and who, as a consequence of such condition, have become a burden to themselves and to others, should be put to death by some painless method.

A crude form of what might be called euthanasia has been practiced by primitive races and savages in all ages. The motives for such practice among primitive people, are, of course, not humanitarian, but rather economic. When the available food supply is limited, the population of such a community must be kept in bounds, and if it increases beyond these limits, some method of curtailing this increase is resorted to. The most common method has been to destroy newborn infants and to kill old people when they have become useless or a burden to the tribe or clan. This practice is found among certain Indian tribes in South America, among the Polynesians, in certain areas of Africa, and many other places. Young infants are either exposed or slain, and old, helpless people are driven out to starve or to be devoured by the wild beasts, or are clubbed to death, sometimes by their own children.

Even among the highly civilized Greeks and Romans a similar practice was common. In Sparta every newborn infant was examined by the elders of the community. If the child was found to be feeble in body or ill-formed, it was rejected and the father had to dispose of it. Even such noble men as Plato and Aristotle favored this inhuman practice. Plato proposed that children born of inferior parents, or children who were deformed, should be put to death. Strabo tells us that on the Greek island of Kos old men would come together garlanded as for a banquet and drink the deadly hemlock, used by the Greeks for the execution of the condemned. The Romans followed a practice similar to that found among the Greeks. The Stoic philosophers, who stressed morality more than any of the other schools of philosophy, favored suicide under conditions when life seemed less desirable than death.

In modern times the idea of euthanasia has appeared in a new form here in America, as well as in Europe. It is advocated by sentimentalists recruited from practically every walk of life, including even ministers of religion. Only recently a large group of Protestant clergymen petitioned the New York Legislature to legalize euthanasia, arguing that medicine, ethics, and religion are in accord on the desirability of mercy death. All advocates of euthanasia argue that an easy, painless death is more humane and more desirable than suffering, helplessness, and pain, and therefore moral. The arguments advanced have a certain sentimental appeal; and it is true that we practice a sort of euthanasia with animals when they have become maimed, old, or are suffering from some incurable disease. But man is not an animal and must never be put on the level of an animal. God gave man power over the life and death of an animal but not over the life

and death of man. This is a sovereign right which God has reserved for Himself. "Thou shalt not kill" is absolute for all times and for all classes of people. "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed, for in the image of God made He man," stands for all time and all conditions. A glance at the references found in a Bible concordance under "murder" will reveal that both in the Old and the New Testament are found innumerable passages condemning in very severe terms every form of murder or homicide. Nowhere is there a single reference which advocates or even condones mercy killings. There was much suffering and misery in the world at the time of Jesus and the Apostles, but neither Jesus nor His Apostles even remotely hint that it would be an act of Christian charity and compassion in certain circumstances to relieve the suffering of fellow men by putting them to death.

The Christian position throughout the ages has been in absolute opposition to that kind of compassion. The very essence of Christian religion and Christian ethics cries out against it. Euthanasia is merely a euphemistic term for murder or suicide and is intended to cover up the real nature of the horribleness of the crime.

By practicing euthanasia man arrogates to himself the sovereign prerogative which belongs to God only. Besides, it is a hopeless attempt to solve the problem of human suffering. The very thought of putting hundreds of thousands of human beings, men, women, and children, to death every year because of their helpless condition is revolting to every Christian.

The idea of mercy killing grows out of a materialistic conception of man. Man is not an accident in an evolutionary process of a material universe. Man is a creation of God. Man was created in the image of God. His life is sacred in the sight of the Creator. God has fixed the canon for all time that he who destroys human life thereby forfeits his own life.

The idea of euthanasia also grows out of an ungodly, atheistic conception of ethics, namely, that there is no absolute standard of right and wrong, but that standards of morality are developed by society itself and that society therefore can change these standards whenever it sees fit. The Ten Commandments, including the Fifth, are absolute. Jesus says, Heaven and earth shall pass away, but not a tittle of the Law.

Mercy killing is also contrary to the natural law because it is against human nature. The strongest instinct in man is to preserve life. Even the old and the sick cling to life to the very end. It is natural for man to shrink from death.

For a Christian this question is not open to debate, and no person living in the fear of God can condone it. No man, not even the State, has an absolute right over life and death. No man can dispose of his own life as he wills. Life comes from God, the Author and the supreme Dispenser of life. Only God can take life.

Moreover, if mercy killings were legalized, all kinds of abuses would follow. No physician can be absolutely sure that the condition of a person is hopeless. Many a person has returned to health and a long life whose condition had been pronounced as hopeless and who by a competent physician was regarded as doomed.

Other very serious objections, objections based on spiritual grounds, should be mentioned. Since sin has come into the world, even suffering and affliction is an instrument of God's hands for the perfection of His saints. Some of God's greatest saints have been great sufferers. Through suffering the Captain of our Salvation was made perfect. Heb. 2:10. And the same is true of Christians, though in a different sense. James calls the afflictions which the Christian must endure the means of testing our faith. Heb. 1:3. And Paul says that Christians must through many trials and tribulations enter eternal life. Every man's works must be tried by fire. 1 Cor. 3:13, 15. There is also comfort in the prospect of eternity, with the glories of which the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared. Rom. 8:18.

And again, by what right can man terminate the period of grace intended by God for a sinner? For the unrepentant sinner euthanasia or any other form of death will not terminate his suffering, but death will only lead to eternal suffering.

To legalize euthanasia would be to abandon the basic teaching of Christianity and to destroy the sanctity of human life and the worth of a human personality. It would encourage suicide and infanticide. Human life would become still cheaper than it now is in this materialistic, godless world. It would be a return to paganism and savagery.

