

Concordia Theological Monthly

Volume 32

Article 24

4-1-1961

Theological Observer

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 (1961) "Theological Observer," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 32, Article 24.
Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol32/iss1/24>

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

THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER

THE CONTROVERSY TODAY

The *London Quarterly and Holborn Review* (October 1960), an English Methodist periodical, commemorating the 400th anniversary of the birth of Jacobus Arminius (1560—1609), presents a number of interesting articles on Arminianism written largely in defense of the doctrine. One, bearing the title given above, stresses the fact that the controversy between Arminianism and strict Calvinism is still on. We read:

The conflict engendered by the view of Arminius is not a mere episode in church history. On the contrary, it focuses, in a convenient and significant way, the perpetual discrepancy within the Christian church between those who lay the whole emphasis on the grace of God in the matter of man's salvation, and those who wish to find some place for human responsibility and choice.

The following paragraph in the article seemed to us to be of more than usual importance:

We can convict Arminius of dangerous doctrine only if we adhere unswervingly to the obvious meaning of Rom. 8:29, 30: "whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son"—that notable *crux* for Arminian commentators. Wesley, it will be remembered, tried to circumvent the difficulty by insisting that St. Paul meant that God first of all foreknew those who would believe in Jesus Christ, and then, on the score of His foreknowledge, predestinated those same people to be "conformed to the image of His Son," and went on to call and justify them. This is, no doubt, a good Arminian interpretation, but it goes against the natural sense of the passage. St. Paul surely intends to convey either that predestination precedes foreknowledge or that predestination and foreknowledge are inseparable and simultaneous—the latter being the more likely interpretation. So we are left in the passage with a "Calvinistic" doctrine of

predestination, and this impression is not diminished by the discussion of election in chapters 9 to 11 of the Epistle. Nor will it really do to say that the word translated "predestinate" or "foreordain" has a weaker sense than these translations suggest, something like "prearrange," for God's prearrangements have the same force as His foreordinances. This passage, then, asserts that our salvation depends entirely and exclusively on the acts of God, and that we have no part to play in the matter, not even the part of accepting the divine ordinance. So far, St. Paul rules out the views of Arminius. But Arminius is entitled to exculpate himself of heresy by adducing the passages in the writings of St. Paul where he speaks as if man received the Gospel by an act of choice, passages such as 2 Cor. 5:20: "we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." St. Paul did not resolve the contradiction between predestination and free will; he seems to have believed in both. [Pp. 265 ff.]

From the viewpoint of Lutheran theology the article contains a number of very serious errors. First, St. Paul did not believe in both predestination and free will but attributes man's salvation entirely to God's grace in Christ Jesus. Secondly, Calvinism commits the mistake of overlooking the Gospel truth that the foreordination, or predestination, of God's elect saints was in Christ Jesus so that by faith in Christ the believer should be sure of his election and salvation (Eph. 1:3-9). Nor does St. Paul teach a bifurcate predestination: one to salvation and another to damnation, as this was taught by Calvin. Romans 9—11 can be rightly understood only as a reproof for those who reject God's salvation in Christ Jesus, as to them God does not owe any saving grace whatever, and a vindication of His ineffable mercy upon the "remnant" of the elect whom He saves in Christ Jesus. Both Calvinism and Arminianism fail to recognize the Gospel and the sac-

raments as divine means of grace by which the Holy Spirit creates and sustains faith in the hearts of men. Arminianism, in particular, fails to see that such admonitions as: "Be ye reconciled to God" do not presuppose any ability in man to reconcile himself to God, either in whole or in part, but that they are efficacious Gospel calls by which the Holy Spirit by grace works saving faith.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

THE LITERARY RELATIONS OF DIDACHE, CH. XVI

The *Journal of Theological Studies* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, October 1960), under this heading, discusses the moot question whether the Didachist in Ch. 16 of the Didache used the gospels of Luke and Matthew or whether he employed sources from which later the two gospels were constructed. The investigation was prompted by two recent publications which assert that "the Didache does not bear witness to our gospels, but quotes directly from sources used by Luke and Matthew." This is the opinion expressed in Prof. R. Glover's book *The Didache's Quotations and the Synoptic Gospels* (October 1958) and in Père J. P. Audet's *La Didache, Instructions des Apôtres*, the latter assigning the whole Didache in its present form, with only a few insignificant exceptions, to a date well before the end of the first Christian century. In support of his thesis also Père Audet argues that the Didachist did not use any of our present gospels. It is, of course, impossible in this very limited space to trace even a bare outline of the author's painstaking research, which he confines to Ch. 16 of the Didache, but he believes that further comparisons will bear out his thesis that the Didachist *did* use Luke and Matthew. In his concluding paragraphs the writer, the Right Reverend B. C. Butler, says:

I have argued that D XVI, with which alone I am directly concerned here, is dependent on Luke, or conceivably on a Proto-Luke (if anyone believes in that hypothetical

entity and in its circulation in the early church). I have also argued that this chapter of D is dependent on a source which I have named M(g). This source was not anything so vague as is the common synoptic tradition. On the contrary, whenever we can supply tests, it points us unerringly to the tradition which is crystalized specifically in Matthew. And M(g), as used by D, already incorporated in itself elements which, when we meet them in Matthew, are customarily explained as borrowings by Matthew from Mark.

There is one further thing to say about this source. Not only does it point us in the direction of Matthew, but comparative documentary analysis, when applied to D XVI, gives us no grounds for distinguishing it from our Matthew [italics our own]. So far as documentary criticism is concerned, and so far as relation to the evidence of D XVI, M(g) might be our Matthew. [P. 283]

Regarding the date of the Didache, Zahn places it ca. A. D. 110, while Harnack suggests ca. A. D. 120—165, though he prefers the former. According to the traditional reckoning our gospels were written before the destruction of Jerusalem (A. D. 70). Today there is a tendency to regard them as composed much later. Mr. Butler's investigation attempts to defend the traditional reckoning.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

WHAT THE ROMAN CATHOLIC LAYMAN WANTS TO HEAR

In No. 5 of the 1960 volume of the *Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift*, pp. 275—287, Roman Catholic Professor Balthasar Fischer of Trier chooses the title "Die Stimme unter der Kanzel [The Voice from in Front of the Pulpit]" to report on the conference of German Roman Catholic homileticians in Würzburg, Germany, last spring. Of particular interest are the 14 petitions in which a panel of lay people summarized their findings at the conference. The panelists were five men and five women, selected to provide a representative cross section of Roman Catholic churchgoers. These were the pleas that they addressed to their preachers:

1. Set aside a period of quiet preparation for your sermons; don't imagine that the layman isn't aware of it when you have failed to do so.

2. Please be good enough to stop after 15 minutes; to insist on talking longer than that isn't of much use.

3. Don't talk in such a frightfully learned fashion to us, using Latin words and foreign expressions and abstract concepts; we retain only what we are able to picture ourselves.

4. Don't talk that "language of Canaan" that nobody except yourselves talks any more, but at the same time don't try so hard to be modern in your speech that you strain yourself. Just talk simple, clear, unpoetic, unsentimental, contemporary German. And when you talk about our workaday world, please be sure that you know what you're talking about.

5. Avoid highly impassioned pleading; we're always afraid that the emotion is simulated.

6. Insure that your sermons are well-organized and easily retained; if you don't, we shall have forgotten them by the time we get to the holy water stoup at the church door on our way out.

7. Don't act as if you yourself had already attained the fullness of Christian sanctity. A person is more ready to believe someone who confesses that he is seeking, suffering, and faltering along with the rest of us. Show that you realize the difficulties that confront a Christian lay person in this world of ours.

8. Give us the nourishing bread of the Word of God. When people are hungry — and we are probably hungrier than our ancestors — they want bread, not cake.

9. Make the picture you give us of God and the vision you give us of His saving mysteries big ones.

10. Don't assume any more than you have to; if you do, you'll be talking over our heads.

11. Make our faith relevant to our everyday existence and our vocation. It hurts us when the word "vocation" on your lips means only vocation to the priesthood and the monastic life. Talk about politics to the extent that your message calls for it, but don't preach

party politics, and don't preach about politics only when there is an election in the offing.

12. Criticize those things about us that deserve criticism and do it with all candor, but don't rant and scold in the pulpit. All you accomplish that way is to harden those who are involved, to excite the malicious glee of those who don't think that they're involved, and to cause pain to those who are really not involved. We know we aren't always what we ought to be — and we suppose that the same thing is true of you, since you're human beings too — but "we don't like to be roared at"! We want to be able to feel that in spite of our sins you take us as seriously as our status as baptized Christians demands.

13. Once in a while make us feel that we belong to a worldwide Church.

14. Instead of knocking us down, encourage us. Give us a little help, a little comfort, a little strengthening, a little hope. Make us rejoice in God and in His great deeds for our salvation.

In reporting on Professor Fischer's article, *Herder-Korrespondenz*, Vol. XV, No. 2 (Nov. 1960), p. 85, observes that the "crisis in preaching" is not something that can be met by methodological changes or even by greater efforts on the part of homileticians. It suggests that a real solution requires a basic change in the theological curriculum which will put the Sacred Scriptures at the center and which will bring the seminarians closer to the daily lives of people as far as this can be done without neglecting the necessary demands of training in self-discipline.

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN

BRIEF ITEMS FROM THE NATIONAL LUTHERAN COUNCIL

Geneva. — The ultimate destiny of the Lutheran World Federation is to unite Lutheran churches everywhere in an ecclesiastical fellowship and to become "an organ of the one globe-circling Lutheran Church," a leading theologian declared here. It is an "ecclesiological anomaly" that the common organization of churches which confess the

same doctrinal basis should be merely "a free association" of bodies that do not even accord pulpit and altar fellowship to one another, Prof. Peter Brunner of the University of Heidelberg asserted.

He said that although it is so defined in its constitution, nevertheless because of its "binding doctrinal basis"—also in the constitution—the federation "is constantly having to act as a church . . . and . . . make decisions which lie within the scope of ecclesiastical doctrinal decisions." Moreover, "developments in the federation itself show that there are internal reasons why it must grow beyond itself," according to Dr. Brunner, who is a member of the LWF Commission on Theology. "The essential tasks which the world federation has set for itself by their very nature demand the action of a church."

The Heidelberg professor of systematic theology expressed his views on the federation as "an ecclesiological problem" in an article appearing in the LWF quarterly *Lutheran World*, published here. The federation, he stated, "can only develop forward spiritually in the direction of a genuine church which is composed of members and spans the globe." He explained, however, that what he contemplated would not be "a Vatican church" and he was not even advocating that LWF member churches "must merge into one single entity." Of this "there can and should be no talk," Professor Brunner stressed.

He emphasized that "the one thing which fundamentally concerns me is that churches which mutually acknowledge that they have the same confessional obligation should not refuse one another pulpit and altar fellowship but should rather make a point of extending it to one another."

In one of several comments on Dr. Brunner's article, published in the same issue, another member of the Commission on Theology, Prof. Regin Preter of the University of Aarhus, Denmark, expressed agreement that "it becomes intolerable when Lutheran

churches of the same confessional stand do not have full church fellowship." But, he argued, if church fellowship requires manifestation in a central organization, a new and separate organ should be developed for that purpose while the LWF should be continued as "a free association of autonomous churches."

"I should like to warn as vehemently as possible," Dr. Preter said, "against the 're-modeling' of the federation in the direction of a 'united' church or a preliminary phase thereto."

The chairman of the commission, Prof. Ernst Kinder of the University of Münster, Germany, also advised against "speaking of a 'globe-circling church' and of the LWF as its official organ." He said that "even though our goal actually is to work toward church fellowship between all Lutheran churches, and even though the LWF serves this end, it should not be expressed in terms such as this, because they easily conjure up misleading conceptions of some kind of organizational superchurch."

Several other contributors of comments expressed similar opinions, among them Dr. Paul C. Empie, executive director of the National Lutheran Council of the United States, and Dr. Edmund Schlink, director of the Ecumenical Institute of the University of Heidelberg.

In an introduction to the series of writings on the nature of the LWF, the Rev. Kurt Schmidt-Clausen, acting executive secretary of the federation, explained that they were contributions to a study ordered by the 1957 assembly in Minneapolis. Furthermore he said, "A comparatively young institution such as the federation, which is entrusted with far-reaching and responsible tasks in many areas of the life of the Lutheran churches, must continually question and be questioned as to whether its activity is always a relevant expression of those principles which called it into being."

Minneapolis.—The American Lutheran Church of 2,258,092 members began its official life here on New Year's Day. As successor to the Evangelical, American, and United Evangelical Lutheran churches, the new denomination, constituted last April, marked the fruition of more than ten years of negotiation for the three-way merger.

During worship services on Jan. 1, observances of the event occurred in many of the 4,939 congregations in the United States and Canada which are united in the new body—the third largest in American Lutheranism. Nearly 90 executives and senior staff members in national or regional church work were also installed in 37 congregations. Ceremonies of installation were held in 18 congregations of the Minneapolis-St. Paul area and in 19 churches from Florida to Canada and from Washington, D. C. to Palo Alto, Calif.

Installation services were held at last April's constituting convention for Dr. Fredrik A. Schiotz, president of The ALC; Dr. Norman Menter of Detroit, Mich., vice-president, and Dr. William Larsen, secretary. District presidents were installed last summer and fall.

More than 200 persons will be employed at church headquarters in Minneapolis in an enlarged building formerly used by the ELC. Many executives and other workers have come from the old ALC in Columbus, Ohio, and the old UELC in Blair, Nebr. Plans for the first year of operations, in most instances, have been under way for the past year.

Two days after the birth of The ALC, the first issue of its official biweekly periodical, the *Lutheran Standard*, appeared with a circulation of 250,000. It will take the place of the old ALC's *Standard*, the ELC's *Lutheran Herald*, and the UELC's *Ansger Lutheran*.

The program of The ALC will be carried on by six divisions—American Missions, World Missions, Education, Publication, Charities, and Pensions; two commissions—

Evangelism and Research and Social Action; and standing committees on Worship and Church Music, Relations to Lutheran Churches, and Public Relations.

Geneva.—The official roll of Lutheran World Federation member churches—which are located in 32 countries around the globe—dropped from 61 to 59 on Jan. 1.

On March 20, however, it will rise again, and the roll will show 62 member churches in 33 countries.

The drop is due to the operational launching of a new denomination formed by the merger of three member bodies of the LWF in the United States.

The rise will be due to the official addition to the roll of two African churches and a Far Eastern one, whose admission was approved by the federation's Executive Committee last March in Porto Alegre, Brazil.

Disappearing from the membership list are the Evangelical Lutheran Church, the American Lutheran Church, and the United Evangelical Lutheran Church, which have merged their identities into The American Lutheran Church of 2,250,000 members.

Appearing on the list during 1961, besides The ALC, will be the 22,000-member Lutheran Church of Central Tanganyika, the 28,000-member Usambara-Digo Lutheran Church of the same country, and the 5,000-member Taiwan Lutheran Church of the island of Formosa.

The 1961 changes reduce the number of North American affiliates of the federation to six and increase the number of Tanganyikan member churches to three.

Denver, Colo.—Lutheran theological seminaries, colleges, and high schools throughout the United States and Canada have a total enrollment of 66,814 students, it was reported here to the National Lutheran Educational Conference. According to Dr. Gould Wickey, Washington, D. C., this is an increase of 4,224 students over last year's grand total of 62,590.

Dr. Wickey told the opening session of the 47th annual convention of the NLEC that the students are studying at 19 seminaries, 32 colleges, 19 junior colleges, and 39 high schools. He is executive director of the organization, which held its first meeting at Harrisburg, Pa., in 1910.

Fifty-seven women are listed among the 3,945 studying theology at Lutheran seminaries, he said in his report on enrollment in Lutheran schools for 1960.

According to the report, the church body affiliation of 3,187 of the seminary students who are classified as regular, showed The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod with 968; United Lutheran Church in America, 706; Evangelical Lutheran Church, 515; American Lutheran Church, 453; and the Augustana Lutheran Church, 269. Other Lutheran bodies accounted for 190 additional seminarians, and 86 enrolled belonged to non-Lutheran churches.

ENROLLMENT IN LUTHERAN FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES

(As of October 1960)

COLLEGE	Under-graduates	Total Credit Students
1. Augsburg, Minneapolis, Minn. (LFC) _____	982	1,229
2. Augustana, Rock Island, Ill. (Aug.) _____	1,293	1,877
3. Augustana, Sioux Falls, S. Dak. (TALC) _____	1,521	1,934
4. Bethany, Bethany, Kans. (Aug.) _____	447	742
5. Capital University, Columbus, Ohio (TALC) _____	1,331	1,763
6. Carthage, Carthage, Ill. (ULCA) _____	529	643
7. Concordia, Moorhead, Minn. (TALC) _____	1,683	1,983
8. Concordia, Fort Wayne, Ind. (Mo.) _____	352	352
9. Concordia Teachers, River Forest, Ill. (Mo.) _____	951	1,710
10. Concordia Teachers, Seward, Nebr. (Mo.) _____	689	1,149
11. Dana, Blair, Nebr. (TALC) _____	445	741
12. Gettysburg, Gettysburg, Pa. (ULCA) _____	1,699	1,990
13. Gustavus Adolphus, St. Peter, Minn. (Aug.) _____	1,148	1,337
14. Hartwick, Oneonta, N. Y. (ULCA) _____	722	895
15. Lenoir Rhyne, Hickory, N. C. (ULCA) _____	964	1,742
16. Luther, Decorah, Iowa (TALC) _____	1,239	1,545
17. Midland, Fremont, Nebr. (ULCA) _____	606	1,073
18. Muhlenberg, Allentown, Pa. (ULCA) _____	1,077	1,788
19. Newberry, Newberry, S. C. (ULCA) _____	680	946
20. Northwestern, Watertown, Wis. (WELS) _____	no report	—
21. Pacific Lutheran University, Parkland, Wash. (TALC) _____	1,561	2,417
22. Roanoke, Salem, Va. (ULCA) _____	712	1,029
23. St. Olaf, Northfield, Minn. (TALC) _____	1,804	1,987
24. Susquehanna University, Selingsgrove, Pa. (ULCA) _____	670	737
25. Texas Lutheran, Seguin, Tex. (TALC) _____	649	744
26. Thiel, Greenville, Pa. (ULCA) _____	898	898
27. Upsala, East Orange, N. J. (Aug.) _____	1,476	3,023
28. Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind. (Mo.) _____	2,667	3,538
29. Wagner, Staten Island, N. Y. (ULCA) _____	1,216	2,432
30. Wartburg, Waverly, Iowa (TALC) _____	1,050	1,050
31. Waterloo, Waterloo, Ont., Canada (ULCA) _____	566	653
32. Wittenberg University, Springfield, Ohio (ULCA) _____	1,657	3,400
Total _____	33,284	47,347

ENROLLMENT IN LUTHERAN SEMINARIES

SEMINARY	Regular	Total Credit Students
1. Augsburg, Minneapolis, Minn. (LFC)	31	31
2. Augustana, Rock Island, Ill. (Aug.)	213	213
3. Bethany, Mankato, Minn. (ELS)	5	5
4. Central, Fremont, Nebr. (ULCA)	49	49
5. Chicago, Maywood, Ill. (ULCA)	115	286
6. Concordia, Springfield, Ill. (Mo.)	486	574
7. Concordia, St. Louis, Mo. (Mo.)	490	703
8. Evangelical, Capital University, Columbus, Ohio (TALC)	238	238
9. Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio (ULCA)	106	108
10. Luther, St. Paul, Minn. (TALC)	555	595
11. Lutheran, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada (TALC)	26	26
12. Lutheran, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada (ULCA)	26	26
13. Lutheran, Gettysburg, Pa. (ULCA)	156	224
14. Lutheran, Philadelphia, Pa. (ULCA)	148	248
15. Lutheran, Thiensville, Wis. (WELS)	82	82
16. Lutheran Southern, Columbia, S. C. (ULCA)	68	108
17. Northwestern, Minneapolis, Minn. (ULCA)	92	101
18. Pacific, Berkeley, Calif. (ULCA)	91	127
19. Wartburg, Dubuque, Iowa (TALC)	201	201
Total	3,178	3,945

CORRECTION

On page 177 of the previous issue of this journal, the *Review of Religious Research* is incorrectly cited as a Roman Catholic periodical. It is the official publication of the Religious Research Association. Membership in this group is not restricted to Roman Catholics but includes Protestants and Lutherans.