



Lutheran Synod Quarterly

SERMON AT FUNERAL OF THE HON. J.A.O. PREUS

REV. T.N. TEIGEN

THE PERSONALITY AND WORK OF THE PROPHET JEREMIAH
(*concluded*)

REV. GEORGE ORVICK

KING SVERRE'S ECCLESIASTICAL CONTROVERSIES
(*continued*)

PROF. R.E. HONSEY

REVISION OF THE EXPLANATION OF LUTHER'S CATECHISM

REV. N. OESLEBY

BOOK REVIEW

POLL ON QUARTERLY NAME

JUNE 1961

FORMERLY THE CLERGY BULLETIN

LUTHERAN SYNOD QUARTERLY

Published by the authority of the General Pastoral Conference of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod

Edited by the Theological Faculty of the E L S Theological Seminary.

George O. Lillegard, Editor-in-Chief, c/o Bethany Lutheran College, Mankato, Minnesota

Volume I Number 4 (Published Quarterly) June, 1961
Subscription price: \$1.50 per year. Single copy, .50¢

Sermon At The Funeral Of Jakob Aall Ottesen Preus, Sr.

Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 26, 1961

by Rev. T.N. Teigen

As we now prepare to lay the mortal remains of Mr. Preus to rest in the bosom of the earth, we ought to do that with a sense of gratitude and thanksgiving to our gracious God. We know where Mr. Preus stood in his time of grace here on earth. The Lord's Apostle says: " If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." (Rom. 10, 9). - Mr. Preus witnessed a good confession. He was not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, but knew it as "the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth." In child-like faith he trusted in the Lord Jesus Christ and nourished that faith with the promises of God's Word and Sacrament. He was aware that he was in the evening of life and gave thought to setting his house in order, knowing that the hour of his departure might come at any moment. We have every reason to believe that he walked through the valley of the shadow of death with the way lit up by the Lamp of God's Truth and crossed over the bridge of the sure promise of the Gospel to the promised land. - And so we ought to meet this day with the words of one of our Christian burial hymns:

Now lay we calmly in the grave,
This form, whereof no doubt we have
That it shall rise again that day
In glorious triumph o'er decay.

True, you are a bereaved family, and particularly you who have been his companion and stay all these years will experience quite a shock at his absence. Adjustments will have to be made. But you will find that the Lord has His own way of healing such wounds, especially if you continue to feed yourself upon the promises with which your gracious God also consoled your husband.

For the past two years it has been my privilege and pleasure to be Mr. Preus's pastor. He was regularly in his pew at the Sunday services and an especially attentive listener. I visited him and his wife frequently in their home, and while there was always a large range of interesting things to talk about, there was never a visit that did not give attention to theology - a field in which he was well-grounded from Christian home and Christian school, much interested and well informed also with regard to the modern heretical currents which have made in-roads on so much of Lutheranism today.

He had, among other things, interesting ideas about preachers and preaching. He expressed himself frequently on the importance of preachers sticking to their text, expounding it in an orderly manner, and by all means emphasizing the great doctrines of Law and Gospel. He had a profound contempt for what he called "show-horses" in pulpit and chancel. In a very recent visit he remarked that he thought Christian preachers would be so concerned about their specific business of saving and caring for souls with the Word of God, that they would consider it a waste of time to be dabbling, in their sermons and addresses and otherwise, in politics and public affairs. And I know that if he were listening today, he would consider that I was not attending to business if the sermon turned out to be a eulogy such as one frequently hears at the funerals of men who have been much in the public eye and have accomplished many things in public life.

I am especially grateful for his expressions on those matters. For one thing, they represent an entirely Scriptural point of view. I am grateful also because they help to rescue me from temptation to spend my time and yours in speaking of matters which, though interesting and in a measure edifying, are still subservient to things infinitely more important. I therefore need to make no apologies for choosing a Scripture text dealing with the great issues of life and death, and expounding it, as I hope, to the edification and comfort of family and friends.

Let me then today bring to your attention particularly two passages which Mr. Preus especially appreciated in a devotion we had last winter when he was in the hospital. The first is from the beautiful 103rd Psalm, verses 15-17: "As for man, his days are as grass: as a flower of the field, so he flourisheth. For the wind passeth over it, and it is gone; and the place thereof shall know it no more. But the mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear him, and his righteousness unto children's children."

You note that the Psalmist here uses an illustration to impress a truth - an illustration which we can readily understand: We know the very transient nature of the grass and flowers. It is before us every day. The flowers you place on the grave tomorrow will be wilted before the day is out. The Psalmist goes on and says that the life of man is like that - very temporary. - That is something that we do not so readily admit, though we know that it is true. The form that during most of life was the embodiment of health and vigor, now lies shrunken and cold and dead in the casket before us.

And it is not only the Christian that recognizes this transient nature of human life. The heathen too acknowledge it. The poet Byron put it this way: "My days are in the yellow leaf; the flowers and fruits of love are gone; the worm, the canker, and the grief are mine alone." -The heathen Roman Emperors, in the midst of the glamorous fan-fare of their position and power were frequently reminded of the grave with the words: "Sic transit gloria mundi," "Thus passes the glory of the world." At every burial service we confess: "Out of the dust wast thou taken, and unto dust shalt thou return. Earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust."

And what is most important to know is the least easy to admit: The passing of human life is a testimony to the power of sin. We know what the Lord's Apostle said: "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." (Rom. 5, 12). You and I will be laid into the grave because we have violated the will of our holy God. "As for man, his days are as grass: as a flower of the field, so he flourisheth. For the wind passeth over it and it is gone; and the place thereof shall know it no more."

Is there no hope then? Is there nothing in this world of vanity and universal death to satisfy our longing for everlasting life? Our Psalmist says: "As for man, his days are as grass: as the flower of the field, so he flourisheth. BUT the mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting, upon them that fear him, and his righteousness unto children's children."

Two words are to be especially noted:

1.) "The MERCY of the Lord." MERCY - that quality in God by which he forgives sin. That is the great theme of the whole Psalm: The Lord is merciful and gracious He hath not dealt with us after our sins. . . . As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us."

2.) "His RIGHTEOUSNESS unto children's children." The believers of the Old Testament knew about that righteousness in prophecy: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: And this is his name whereby he shall be called: THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS." (Jer. 23, 5, 6). That was a prophecy of the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. We know it in its fulfillment: "When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law." (Gal. 4, 4 . 5). He perfectly fulfilled the Law which we were obligated to fulfill, but could not. He took the consequences of our sin upon Himself and made satisfaction for it which we could not make. Thus He fulfilled all RIGHTEOUSNESS for us. "God made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." (2Cor. 5, 21). "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." (2 Cor. 5, 19). His righteousness is imputed to us. God for His sake forgives sin. He declares us righteous. He justifies us. He looks on us in Christ as though we had never sinned. That is our

consolation in our death valley. The mercy of God in Christ Jesus in Whom and through Whom death is swallowed up in victory.

How can we know that? How can we be sure?

That brings us to our second passage, 1 Peter 1, 24 . 24: "For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away, but the WORD OF THE LORD ENDURETH FOREVER. And this is the Word which by the Gospel is preached unto you."

The work by which God showed mercy was not done in a corner. God has revealed it to us. He has told us about it. "He has committed unto us the Word of reconciliation." (2 Cor. 5, 19). This text, like the other, emphasizes the changing character of everything material and the fickleness and vanity of everything human. Everything material will change and decay, and men may be liars. BUT THE WORD OF THE LORD ENDURETH FOREVER. He has told us of His mercy in a language we can understand. He will not go back on His Word. Our salvation is founded upon the person and work of Jesus the eternal Son of God Himself. It is assured to us in the Gospel of His mercy and imputed righteousness, in the Word of God which is as eternal and sure as God Himself.

These things we need to know. Without them all is vanity and hopelessness. With them we can live a truly happy and useful life and die a blessed death.

I am well aware that many there are - some possibly in this audience - who look upon things temporal as if they were eternal; who wrap themselves up in the tinsel of this world as if it were an eternity-proof armour; who are so busy with their work and play that they have no time to face the facts realistically - no time to bring their eyes to read, and ears to hear, and hearts to understand the things that make for true peace and usefulness. That is a foolhardy existence.

I am also aware that many there are - and possibly also some in this audience - who would not deny that the Word of the Lord endureth forever, but who are not sure that anyone can know that Word. They regard it unthinkable that the Lord would cause it to be recorded in words in a book. That too, is a fool-hardy and blasphemous attitude to take.

I am glad to state that the things of God's mercy and truth in Christ Jesus as recorded in the Sacred Scriptures - these Mr. Preus believed and confessed. In these things he found his hope and consolation. And he has not been put to shame.

May you, too, dear friends, be realists. May you recognize the vanity and passing nature of everything material and human. May you recognize that you too, because of sin are justly subject to God's curse and everlasting death. BUT may you also trust in and confess the Word of God's grace and mercy in Christ Jesus revealed in the everlasting Gospel. - It will not fail you, but will lead you through the valley of the shadow of death into the glorious mansions of eternal life. "The Word of the Lord endureth forever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." Amen.

"THE PERSONALITY AND WORK OF THE PROPHET JEREMIAH"

Part II

By Rev. George Orvick

(Concluded from the March Issue)

The Prophet During The Reign of Zedekiah

Zedekiah was not the tyrant that Jehoiakim was. He was more benevolent, but at the same time was weak and vacillating. Jeremiah was now able to appear in public and did not have to hide from the king. In chapter 21 of Jeremiah we read that Zedekiah sent Pashur t'o Zephaniah to enquire of Jeremiah what the Lord had to say about their relations with Babylon. Jeremiah foretold that Babylon would conquer what was left of the city and that Zedekiah and his servants would be captured and shown no mercy. In chapter 24 we are told that Jeremiah saw a vision of two baskets of figs. One had very good figs, this represented the people that were carried away captive, the best of the nation. The other represented bad figs, these were the poor and less capable left in Judah. Jeremiah could see no hope for those who were left behind. If those who were captured would abide in the city of Babylon in peace they would eventually be able to return.

In the meantime Egypt was stirring up the small countries against Babylon. Under pressure of the false prophets, Zedekiah cast his lot with these rebellious nations against Babylon. Jeremiah thereupon made a yoke and wore it about his neck as a symbol of the fact that Judah should remain under the yoke of Babylon. In 27, 6-7 he calls Nebuchadnezzar the servant of the Lord and says that Judah should serve him and not rebel. If they did they would be destroyed. Jeremiah took the matter out of politics and made it a matter of obeying the Lord, that they should not rebel against Babylon. This brought a clash with the false prophets. One of them, Hananiah, took the wooden yoke and broke it, saying that they would not have to serve Babylon. But Jeremiah then forged a yoke of iron to show that the yoke could not be broken.

Zedekiah held off rebelling against the Babylonians until about 588. Then under new leadership from Egypt the rebellion broke out. Nebuchadnezzar moved swiftly to put down the revolution. In 588 he laid siege to Jerusalem. Resistance was futile. Jeremiah advised the citizens to desert to the Babylonians if they wanted to save their lives. Jere. 21, 8-9. In chapter 37 we are told that there was a lull in the battle because Pharaoh's army came out against the Babylonians. This gave those in Judah new hope. But Jeremiah prophesied that they would come right back and destroy them. On account of these recommendations Jeremiah was accused of weakening the hands of the men of war. One day when Jeremiah was going to his home town he was arrested by the princes, accused of deserting to the enemy, beaten and imprisoned.

The king was so weak and vacillating that he still thought Jeremiah might be right, so he had him brought secretly out of the prison. Jeremiah was asked

by the king, "Is there any word from the Lord?" The prophet was rather kindly toward the king but only reminded him that his prophecies were coming true. Zedekiah was about to release him from prison when the princes again intervened and demanded that he be put to death. Zedekiah gave in and the princes let Jeremiah down by ropes into a cistern used to catch water during the rainy season. There he was left to starve. But he was rescued by an Ethiopian Eunuch who at the king's orders, drew him out of the pit and restored him to the court guard. (Jer. 38, 6ff)

In chapter 38, 14-28 we are told that Zedekiah once again sent for Jeremiah and another secret conference took place but with the same results. The end of Zedekiah was terrible. The Babylonians made a breach in the wall of the city. Zedekiah was captured, made to view the execution of his sons, had his eyes put out and was carried off in chains to Babylon. In chapter 39, 11-12 we are told that Nebuchadnezzar released Jeremiah from prison.

The Lachish Letters (Jer. 38, 4)

Quoted from the book "Archaeology and Bible History", page 222, by Joseph Free. "In the excavation of the site called Telled-Duweir, ~~now identified~~ with the Biblical town of Lachish, J. L. Starkey found in 1935 a group of 18 potsherds bearing on their surface several military messages written by an army officer to his superior officer stationed at Lachish. W. F. Albright has pointed out that in one of these letters (No. 6) the army officer complains that the royal officials had sent out circular letters which weaken the hands of the people. The army officer who wrote this Lachish letter used the expression, "weaken the hands," to describe the effect of the over-optimism of the royal officials, whereas the officials, referred to in the book of Jeremiah in turn had used the same expression in describing the effect of Jeremiah's realistic prophecy concerning the approaching fall of Jerusalem. The royal officials were deemed guilty of the very action which they sought to ascribe to Jeremiah." These letters contain a number of names which occur in the Bible. Whether the names in the Lachish letters refer to the same individuals as given in the Bible one cannot say, but it is significant that at least three of the names in the letters appear in the O. T. only in the days of Jeremiah, Gemariah (36, 10) Jaazaniah (36, 3) and Neriah (36, 4). Other names include Mattaniah and Jeremiah; the name Jeremiah in the letters does not necessarily refer to the prophet. Thus we have military dispatches written at the time Jeremiah was living in Judah and even giving names mentioned by the prophet. It is no wonder Haupt remarks that we have had no archaeological discovery up to recent years which has had more direct connection with the Bible than the Lachish letters. They provide us with a virtual supplement to Jeremiah."

The Prophet During The Time Of Gedaliah (587-586)

After the death of Zedekiah, Judah was but a province of the Chaldean Empire. Nebuchadnezzar appointed Gedaliah, son of Ahikam, as the governor. Gedaliah sought to consolidate all the rebel forces into a law abiding state which would

be subject to the Chaldeans. He promised the people that the Chaldeans would be fair with them and would reward them with the fruits of their harvest. The people rallied around Gedaliah since he was a good statesman and did not seek revenge upon the Chaldeans. The Judean refugees who had fled to other countries now began to return to their homeland.

There would have been a good chance for Judah to become a safe and prosperous land if they had cooperated with Gedaliah. But a certain Bedouin Chieftain named Baalis had other ideas. Baalis chose a Judean captain named Ishmael as his puppet. He stirred up Ishmael and his followers to the extent that they plotted the destruction of Gedaliah. Johanan warned Gedaliah, but Gedaliah did not believe him. Ruthlessly Ishmael, accompanied by ten men, went to visit Gedaliah. They were invited to dine with him. While they were at the meal, in bold violation of the Oriental law of hospitality Ishmael and his men rose up, set upon Gedaliah and his colleagues, including the Chaldean officials, and murdered them all. He also murdered all but 10 of 80 pilgrims who had come to the temple to make their sacrifices.

His dastardly work done, Ishmael compelled the entire population of Mizpah, including the royal princesses who had been put in Gedaliah's care, and almost certainly including Jeremiah and Baruch, to proceed toward Ammon. When Johanan and the captains and their men heard of this they rushed to intercept Ishmael. They met at the pool of Gibeon. The Judean people abandoned Ishmael and joined Johanan. Ishmael was clever and escaped into the Ammonite country of King Baalis.

Now the restless and fearsome people had to decide what they would do. They were afraid of reprisals should they go back to Judea because they knew of the wrath of Nebuchadnezzar. They asked Jeremiah for a word from the Lord. Jeremiah told them that God wanted them to go down to Egypt.

The remnant that fled to Egypt included at least several thousand people, including Jeremiah and Baruch, for even though they disregarded his advice they still wanted him there. Of the journey to Egypt we know nothing. We know only that they came at length to Egypt's frontier fortress Tahphanhes, where already many Jews lived and from whom they would naturally receive a welcome. However, we know very little about the life of this remnant of Judah in Egypt.

The Jews felt that now they would be safe from the wrath of the Chaldeans. But Jeremiah now makes another symbolic prophecy. Shortly after they arrived in Tahphanhes a divine impulse came to the prophet which he explicitly obeyed. "In secrecy" which Skinner interprets as implying a night scene, Jeremiah took some large stones and buried them in the Quadrangle into which opened the gate of royal government office building. Then (43:10) comes the Word of the Lord-- he is bringing Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon in a plundering campaign against the Pharaoh of Egypt. He will bring the Egyptians under his power, and these buried and now invisible stones will form the foundation for the Chaldean invader's throne over which he will stretch his canopy. The very land in whose protection Judah,

fleeing from the Chaldeans, has placed her trust, will itself be smitten by those same Chaldeans.

Jeremiah's prophecy, which did not imply the permanent occupation of Egypt by the Chaldeans but a chastizing expedition of superior strength was actually fulfilled in the thirty-seventh year of Nebuchadnezzar, 588, some nineteen years after Jeremiah's words were spoken.

The Last Prophecy of Jeremiah

In chapter 44 we have the last prophecy of Jeremiah to the people of Judah. An assembly was called for all Judeans who were in Egypt. It included those living in the extreme Northern part of the country (Migdol and Tahpanhes and Memphis), and those who were in upper Egypt (Pathros), both Jews who had been settled there a long time and those who were newcomers on the scene. It embraced the entire Diaspora in Egypt.

To the Diaspora in Egypt came the Lord's message through Jeremiah. The truth of that word should now be clear to every Judean, that the desolation of Jerusalem and all Judah represents the Lord's judgement upon his people because of their sins (Vss. 1-2) Jeremiah asks them why they have cut themselves off from the land of Judah, why they have begun worshipping the false gods of the land instead of their Jehovah. But in 44, 16 we are told that the men would not listen to him but were determined to continue to "burn incense to the queen of heaven and to pour out drink offerings to her, just as we and our fathers have done".

As at the very beginning of his ministry, Jeremiah became aware that the Lord was "awake over his word to perform it," so at the end of it he is solemnly aware that God was awake over his word to perform it in judgement upon the remnant of Judah. Keenly did he feel how great was the responsibility of this present Judean remnant for the future of Judean religion. The tragic fact was that they had no true faith in the Lord to pass on.

The worship of the Lord on the part of the Egyptian Jews is a dead faith. In all that land soon the time will come when the worship of the Lord will be extinct.

According to Leslie the words of Jeremiah come to an end in chapter 44, 26-28. Here he appeals to time. Time will tell whose word is true. His prophecy ends with the same thought as that with which it began, "I am awake over my word to accomplish it" (1, 12).

The Personality of Jeremiah

Of all the prophets of the Bible, Jeremiah is probably the most interesting, because the most self-revealing. None have told us so much about themselves, their feelings and emotions, as this tragic figure, so strangely compounded of intrepid boldness, which makes him brave the fierce animosity and hatred of people and leaders alike, and a diffident shrinking from his task of telling them the doom which inexorably awaits them--a task which he fain would abandon altogether if he could, but must perform despite himself. Other prophets delivered their messages, but

revealed little of what they felt in doing so. Jeremiah goes further; he reveals the psychology of the prophet, lays bare the emotion of the man singled out to be the mouth piece of God. We might have expected a feeling of elation; instead Jeremiah feels poignant sorrow, at times even rebelliousness against his Divinely ordained mission.¹³

Pessimist or Optimist

There is general disagreement among authors as to the real personality of Jeremiah. Some believe that his prophesying doom and his gloomy predictions concerning the future of Judah are due simply to the fact that he was a born complainer, a social misfit, an unfriendly, uncompromising man. They completely disregard the fact that in his prophesying he was simply obeying the will of God and speaking the words that God gave to him. Yes, his personality is surely bound up in his work and shows through, but some read into his statements more than ought to be attributed to his own feelings.

One author, Brooke Peters Church, in his book, The Private Lives of the Prophets,¹⁴ makes Jeremiah out to be a complete misfit. The passage, "Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet to the nations" Jer. 1, 5, Church interprets as Jeremiah's own rationalization of why he is different from other men, instead of accepting it as it stands as God's revelation to Jeremiah. From this passage Church draws the unwarranted conclusion that Jeremiah was a social misfit from boyhood. He conjectures that as a boy he was not well liked, was the butt of much teasing, and was left out of associations with other children.

Rabbi Freedman, in his book on Jeremiah, takes the opposite view. He says, "Jeremiah has been called a pessimist. His very name had become symbolic of gloom. Yet nothing could be further from the truth. His lines were not cast in pleasant places. He was fated to see the utter destruction of his beloved country, and his prophecies must be viewed in that light. It is more correct to describe him as a realistic optimist; 'realistic', because he would not be lulled, nor allow the people to be lulled, into a false sense of security; 'optimist,' because beyond the immediate blackness he saw a brightness for his people, spiritually purified by their sufferings, restored to their homeland, a reunited nation living on their own soil.

The Prophet's Tenderness

Jeremiah shows a special knowledge and sympathy with animals. He knew the haunts and habits of the beasts and birds, the wild ones that lurked in the tropical growth of the Jordan valley, the smaller, shyer kinds that lived in the uplands, and the domestic animals that he saw on every farm. His preaching in later life is pervaded with references to the wild life which he came to love so deeply.

"Therefore a lion out of the forest shall slay them, and wolf of the evenings shall spoil them..." (5;6). Lions and wolves still abounded in the jungle region near Jericho, a region which he could look down upon from his home, and which was not too long a walk for an active boy. "Yea, the stork in the heaven knoweth her appointed times; and the turtle and the crane and the swallow observe the time of their coming..." (8;7)

Church believes that his fondness for animals was a result of his rejection by his fellow playmates while he was a boy, but we find this hard to believe.

In his descriptions he betrays a human sympathy for animals that is quite unlike anything else in the Old Testament. There is an especially vivid word-picture of wild creatures in a time of drought, almost modern in its fellow-feeling for the stricken beasts. "Yea, the hind also calved in the field, and forsook it, because there was no grass. And the wild asses did stand in the high-places, they snuffed up the wind like dragons; their eyes did fail, because there was no grass." (14;5, 6)

When reading the dire prophecies of Jeremiah, his threats upon the rebellious people, his curse upon their evil doings, one might gather that Jeremiah took delight in being cruel. But this is far from the case. He prophesied with a heavy heart. He only warned the people because he knew he had to. In reality, Jeremiah would rather have remained a private citizen, seeing nothing and saying nothing. He did not want to be a prophet. But he was overpowered by the will of Jehovah.

Isaiah and Jeremiah

It may seem at first glance that Isaiah is much more cheerful than Jeremiah and of a much more pleasing personality. But then it must be remembered that the two were prophesying under entirely different circumstances. Jeremiah's task was much more difficult than that of Isaiah's. In the supreme moment of Judea's trial, when Sennacherib's army lay encamped about Jerusalem, Isaiah had the grateful duty of assuring Hezekiah that the city would not fall. It is pleasant to say what one's listener desires to hear. But when more than a century later the Holy City was again menaced, this time by Nebuchadnezzar's forces, Jeremiah had to face obloquy and hatred, taunts of cowardice and defeatism and an accusation of treason when he had to advise submission to the conqueror. The difference in the two messages was not due to theological outlook or personality as is sometimes argued. Each spoke the words which God had put into his mouth, and each was corroborated by the outcome of events.

Far from wishing the destruction of his people, he earnestly pleads with God for leniency on their behalf, asserting that they had been deceived by false leaders. In a moment of rebelliousness he goes so far as almost to throw the blame upon the Almighty Himself, "Then said I; 'Ah, Lord God! surely Thou hast greatly deceived this people and Jerusalem saying; Ye shall have peace; where as the sword reacheth unto the souls.'" This demonstrates the deep sympathy

and tenderness of Jeremiah as he, like Jacob, wrestles with the Lord in prayer.

Jeremiah's Courage

Although Jeremiah was more of the shrinking type by nature, he still did not lack the courage that was necessary to fulfill his work. He was not afraid to brave the fury of his people. He endured the enmity of his own family. His life was often in danger. He was taunted, jeered, imprisoned. He denounced the leaders, not even stopping with the king. But he had such confidence in Jehovah that he was not afraid.

Jeremiah's Celibacy

Marriage was a matter of great importance among the Hebrews, and from the earliest times their laws are concerned with rules and regulations about that relationship. We know that Priests and Prophets married like anyone else. We know that Hosea, Isaiah and Ezekiel all had wives. Jeremiah, however, remained a bachelor all of his life.

What was the reason for his celibacy? Some try to make out that Jeremiah fell in love with some girl who had been promised to another member of his family. The marriage was impossible because he could not obtain parental consent, and this is the reason why Jeremiah was so angry with his family. "Let me see thy vengeance on them; for unto thee have I revealed my cause." (11:20) We know that on one occasion a plot was arranged at a family gathering to poison him. But to draw the conclusion that this was due to a family argument over his marriage is entirely untenable. The reason that he was rejected by his family was the fact that his preaching about the impending doom of the country and his advice to surrender to the Babylonians made him so unpopular also with them.

Jeremiah explains his celibacy in chapter 16, verse 2, by quoting Yahweh: "Thou shalt not take thee a wife, neither shalt thou have sons or daughters in this place." Some authors say that this is merely Jeremiah's way of explaining away his celibacy and that this is not really the case. We, however, believe that we ought to take Jeremiah at his word and not try to read into this statement any hidden meaning.

It was actually very provident on the part of Yahweh to forbid Jeremiah to marry. The type of life he was to lead -- being in constant danger, being imprisoned, being hated by most all his countrymen, and finally being carried off to Egypt with the fleeing Israelites --- this would have been no life for a wife and children to endure. So it is purely natural that his Lord should forbid him to marry. His many references to brides and bridegrooms may indicate a longing desire for the love and companionship of marriage. Surely such a kind and affectionate man would have enjoyed the marriage relationship. But he placed the will of Jehovah above his own wishes and desires.

Jeremiah's Social Life

"For thus saith the Lord, Enter not into the house of mourning, neither go to lament nor bemoan them." (16:5)

"Thou shalt not also go into the house of feasting, to sit with them to eat and to drink." (16:8)

Jeremiah seems never to have made friends easily. There is no hint in his writing of normal social relationships or of any close friends. Later in life he made a few contacts and in some degree was reconciled with his family. But we do not attribute this to any unfriendliness of his personality. It was not that he was just plain hard to get along with. In his writings he shows that he longed for friendship and complained of his loneliness. It was his difficult mission that made such contacts impossible. The Lord had separated him from the rest of society because of his special calling. His natural self rebelled against this, but in obedience to the Word of Jehovah within him, he remained aloof. The character of his prophecy, as before mentioned, was not one that would attract many friends. The people did not enjoy what he had to say. No one likes to have his sins so painfully and so clearly pointed out. Thus they thought of Jeremiah as a self-righteous uncompromising man. But Jeremiah was uncompromising because God is uncompromising. He hated evil because God hates evil.

Conclusion

Jeremiah was timid, sensitive, introspective, and full of fears. At times he longed to flee from it all, and dwell in the wilderness. To be a prophet was to him an excruciatingly painful experience. Yet he could not escape his prophetic mission. For over forty years he had to speak the Lord's word which was constantly counter to his own inclination and to that of the people to whom that prophetic word came.¹⁵

We do not therefore attribute Jeremiah's supposed unfriendliness, his celibacy, his family troubles, his nature loving, to a personality that simply could not co-operate with his surroundings.

We find in Jeremiah a true minister of the Gospel. He was unpopular because the law of God is unpopular. No one likes to hear God's verdict against sin. "The soul that sinneth it shall die", Ezekial 18, 4. "The wages of sin is death," Romans 6, 23. When this law of God is preached in all of its condemning wrath, people are bound to take offense at it because by nature they imagine themselves to be righteous in the sight of the Lord.

But Jeremiah was a preacher, not only of the law, but also of the sweetest Gospel. He offered to all those who would repent and turn from their wicked ways complete forgiveness. "Return, ye backsliding children, and I will heal your backslidings. Behold, we come unto thee; for thou art the Lord our God. Truly

in vain is salvation hoped for from the hills and from the multitude of mountains; Truly in the Lord our God is the salvation of Israel." 3, 22-23.

Jeremiah pleaded with God for the forgiveness of his people as Abraham pleaded for Sodom and as Moses pleaded for the people in the wilderness. Even as a minister of the Gospel today must point out the sins of his people by showing them the law of God, but then directing them to the Redeemer Jesus Christ for forgiveness, so Jeremiah was a preacher of the law and the Gospel. Much, therefore, that is attributed to his uncompromising personality, must rather be attributed to the nature of his message and to the times in which he lived.

Footnotes, Part II

12. Free, Joseph, Archaeology and Bible History. p. 222-223
13. Freedman, op. Cit., p. xi
14. Church, Brooke Peters, The Private Lives of the Prophets, p. 144
15. Leslie, op. cit., p. 344

KING SVERRRE'S ECCLESIASTICAL CONTROVERSIES

By Rudolph E. Honsey
Part IV

(Continued from March Issue)

SVERRRE'S CONTROVERSIES WITH POPE INNOCENT III

Early in 1198 the old Pope Celestine III, for several years a nonegenarian, died. He was succeeded by the most aggressive and powerful of all men who have occupied the Holy See, Innocent III. "In him Rome received a man who could speak the cause of the church in a far more powerful way than the old and cautious Pope Celestine. As an organizer he (Innocent) was highly equipped, as a politician of keen insight always aware of the weak points of his opponent, but not always well balanced in his mode of battle."⁵⁷

In comparison to his strengths, however, Innocent's weaknesses were rather insignificant. "In appearance he was small but his presence was distinguished and commanding . . . His personality was dynamic rather than magnetic, a man to be feared more than loved. He was an accomplished speaker . . . He was a preacher and expositor rather than a philosopher, though he could wield the syllogism with the best."⁵⁸ A realist rather than an idealist, practical rather than theoretical, an administrator rather than a scholar, a politician rather than a theologian, Innocent III stepped forward on the world scene at a remarkably early age for a Pope,

⁵⁷ Paasche, op. cit., p. 192

⁵⁸ The Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. VI, p. 2.

only 37 years old. He did not, like Hildebrand, who later became Pope Gregory VII, prefer to remain in the background as the "power behind the throne" before taking the highest office in the Catholic Church. Innocent desired not only power, but also prestige, glory and fame. In his methods he was unscrupulous; in his dealings with his enemies he was ruthless. He was a hard-bitten realist. "Innocent III was not like Gregory (VII) just an idealist; he was first and foremost a practical politician (realpolitiker) and a marvelous diplomat who used all means in order to attain his goals. Therefore also he came closer than any of those who have sat in the chair of Peter to the great goal of the popes, world domination."⁵⁹

It was Innocent III who received praise, honor and homage from kings and princes as well as from his own churchmen at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, just the year before his rather early death. Thus the year 1215, which in the case of the Magna Charta in England revealed a tendency away from centralized authority in the state, was marked by the most vivid expression of centralized authority in the church. It is not strange that Innocent III strongly opposed the Magna Charta and forbade its observance in England under penalty of excommunication. The fact that he died within a year made his objections against it of short duration.

Innocent made most of the monarchs of Europe tremble, and many of them were deeply humiliated by him. In his dealings with the various crowned heads of Europe, Innocent always assumed the role of the superior, and spoke condescendingly to kings as though they were in reality only his humble vassals. He was governed by the thought that the Pope is responsible to God for the salvation of kings just as well as for the salvation of ecclesiastics or laymen. Therefore, he assumed the superior role.

Perhaps in no other controversy did Innocent III reveal his great power more forcibly than in his dispute with King John of England. John was a son of an able English king, Henry II. He was a younger brother of Richard (the Lion-Hearted) of crusade fame, and in the absence of Richard he assumed control of the kingdom. In the year 1199, Richard died and John succeeded him to the throne.

Almost without exception historians give us an unfavorable picture of John: mean, grasping, ruthless, deceitful, cowardly. Perhaps this has been exaggerated, whereas the picture given us of his brother, Richard, has been glamorized. John was not lacking in energy or insight. He was clever and amusing. In discussion, he was shrewd, though often sophisticated. He owned a biting tongue informed by wit and observation. Though he tended to be indolent, he was not neglectful of business. On the other hand, he was of an unbalanced and erotic temperament. Extremely suspicious, he frequently yielded to extreme fits of anger and cruelty. His selfish and self-centered nature made it almost impossible for him to show respect or consideration for the views, feelings or wishes of others. Unreliable and distrustful, he was a very evil man. He was called hostis naturae, an enemy of nature.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ Bugge, op. cit., p. 203

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 232.

In spite of his many bad qualities, one cannot help feeling sorry for King John, for his reign was filled with setbacks and defeats. It was his misfortune to get involved in three major controversies, all of which he lost. He was in a dispute with the nobles, who desired more rights for themselves and demanded a curtailment of the arbitrary power of King John. Out of that issue came the Magna Charta, which guaranteed them rights, and which John was compelled to sign. Furthermore, John was involved in difficulty with King Philip Augustus of France, and consequently he lost most of the Plantagenet lands which England had owned in northern France. His other controversy was the serious one with Innocent III.

It was inevitable that a dispute would arise between two men as insistent on their rights, as stubborn and as high-handed as John and Innocent. The dispute arose concerning the election of an Archbishop of Canterbury by John. "The king set his mind . . . on having as archbishop a man who had been trained in the royal service under his eye and was familiar with his affairs."⁶¹ The man whom John had in mind as Archbishop of Canterbury was the Bishop of Norwich, John de Grey. John persuaded the monks of Christ Church, Canterbury, to elect him Archbishop of Canterbury in December, 1205. This was done without consulting Pope Innocent. Some of the monks preferred to have their sub-prior, Reginald, as Archbishop, and they elected him as such at another meeting. That was clearly uncanonical.

The Pope learned of these elections, and objected. He insisted on a new election, to which John agreed. Then John secretly exacted an oath from a majority of the sixteen electors to elect again John de Grey. Innocent, however, preferred to have Stephen Langton elected, and he urged the electors to elect him. In spite of their oath to John, the electors chose Stephen Langton. This was done in December, 1206. John refused to assent to the election. Then the Pope took things into his own hands, and he himself consecrated Langton as Archbishop of Canterbury. John was enraged, and put much pressure on the monks, and other clerics. He seized all the property of the Canterbury monks, whom he partly held responsible for the election, and in general he tried to show his authority. Then Simon Langton, a brother of the Archbishop, in a letter to the English people, said that John was putting himself up against the will of the church. Thereby he was imposing upon his vassals an obligation which made them traitors to the supreme lord, the King of Kings, God Himself. In his appeal to the English people, Simon Langton emphasized the feudal idea, stating that the people owed their first allegiance to God, and not to King John. ⁶²

In reply to John's seizure of the property of the Canterbury monks, Innocent resorted to one of his favorite weapons, the interdict. On Passion Sunday, March 23, 1208, Innocent laid England and Wales under the interdict. The interdict under which England was laid was not a complete interdict in which there was a total deprivation of spiritual services, but it greatly restricted them. Although at first the interdict was not carried out in all churches, it did not take long for it to be rigidly enforced. "Acquiescence on the part of the lower clergy was inevitable, and for six years Englishmen had all around them a Church which did not function, closed buildings, unused cemeteries, silent bells, disconsolate dignitaries, and persons whose only duties were the baptism of infants in private houses or the celebration of mass for the dying."⁶³

61 Ibid., pp. 232

62 Ibid., pp. 233 f.

63 Ibid., p. 236

The interdict had a tremendous effect upon the people of England. Such rigid restrictions upon their spiritual functions had the effect of turning them against their king for the most part. They blamed him for closing churches of England and, as they thought, shutting up Heaven to them. So John became even more unpopular in the eyes of his people. When John persisted and stubbornly refused to yield to him, Innocent excommunicated him, and released his subjects from their oath of allegiance to him. The situation became more and more serious. Furthermore, although Innocent had previously had occasion to censure and excommunicate Philip Augustus of France, he now supported him in the war against John. That, plus the general hostile feeling of the people against him, plus the humiliation of the excommunication and the interdict, plus whatever pangs of conscience he might have in regard to his own soul and the souls of his people, finally caused him to yield to the demands of the Pope in 1213. John agreed to hand England over to the Pope and to receive it again as a fief. That most clearly indicated that their relation was that of suzerain and vassal. England was now as before carrying on its full service, John was again received into the Church, and the dispute was settled. It was a complete victory for Innocent III, but a humiliating defeat for John.

Before we take up the subject of Innocent's controversies with Sverre, we shall briefly examine his relations with the powerful King of France at that time, Philip Augustus.

During his first year as Pope, and in fact at the very beginning of his papacy, Innocent had occasion to be involved in a conflict with Philip Augustus. It concerned itself with Philip's putting away his wife, Ingeborg, Princess of Denmark, trying to divorce her, and then marrying Agnes, daughter of the Duke of Meran.

It all began after the death of Philip's first wife, Elizabeth, on March 15, 1190. Three months after her death, Philip went on the third Crusade with two other distinguished rulers, Frederick Barbarossa and Richard, the Lion-Hearted. After his return, he looked for another wife. He wanted a marriage that would be helpful politically. In those days, politics played an important role in royal marriages. For political reasons he decided to try to gain the hand of a Danish princess. The present ruler of Denmark was Cnut VI, and he had a sister named Ingeborg, "beautiful in face, more beautiful in soul," and not, it would seem, more than eighteen years old.⁶⁴ He made the arrangements with her older brother, King Cnut, and everything seemed to be satisfactory. On August 14, 1193, they were married. The next day the young bride was crowned. But the happiness of her wedding and the glory of her coronation were short-lived. "On the very day she was crowned queen, her husband cast her off. Even while the crowning was being solemnized, he seemed to tremble and turn pale, and hardly could he endure till the ceremony was at an end."⁶⁵ "The king's pleasure in the bride changed in a few hours to a feeling of aversion."⁶⁶

⁶⁴ William Holden Hutton, Philip Augustus (London & New York, 1896). p. 160.

⁶⁵ Ibid., pp. 161 f.

⁶⁶ The Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. VI, p. 287.

Ingeborg was treated shamefully, and the young queen sought justice. The Archbishop of Rheims did not help her. Then she turned to old Pope Celestine III, who did his best, sending a papal legate to Philip, but in vain. Philip had claimed as a reason for putting Ingeborg away that they were related within the prohibited degrees, and the marriage was dissolved by a council of bishops and magnates at Compeigne. Celestine annulled the decision in May 1195, after the appeal by Ingeborg and King Cnut, but it did not turn Philip from his course. "Disregarding the papal injunctions, Philip took a more irrevocable step in defiance of the church and, after approaching several ladies in vain, he married Agnes, daughter of the Duke of Meran, in June, 1196."⁶⁷

"Three years passed by in threats and negotiations. New legates, new gatherings of bishops, new letters from the aged Pope, attempted to deal with this scandal. And meantime Ingeborg remained practically a prisoner, patiently waiting for justice. She was forced, it is said, to sell her jewels, her very clothes, to seek alms."⁶⁸

Then on January 8, 1198, Innocent III ascended the papal throne. One of his first acts was to write a formal letter to Philip. Then immediately he wrote to the bishop of Paris to warn Philip of his sin of having put away Ingeborg and married another. Soon he wrote directly to Philip himself. "I command you," he said "that you judge your own acts so that you be not condemned of others. Recall your lawful wife, and then we will hear all that you may lawfully urge. If this you do not, no power shall turn us to right or left till justice be done."⁶⁹ But Philip did not yield.

Innocent waited until later to take drastic action. Then, in October of the year 1199, Innocent wrote a long, clear and stern appeal to the clergy of France to try to make the king change his ways. His sin had been two-fold: He had lived in open sin with one while his legally married wife was still living, and he had flouted a papal decree. Kings must be taught that they were not exempted from the duties of the ordinary Christian.⁷⁰

A papal legate was therewith instructed to lay France under an interdict unless Philip would take back his lawful wife. Philip refused and the interdict was published on January 13, 1200.⁷¹ On February 5, the interdict was put in force. Some clergy, through terror of the King, or love of their flocks, or striving to be at peace with all men, would not publish it. Innocent would brook no resistance. On March 11 he wrote again: "The remedy is harsh in truth, but strong diseases are not cured by gentle treatment."⁷²

⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 288.

⁶⁸ Hutton, op. cit., p. 164.

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 165.

⁷⁰ The Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. VI, p. 288.

⁷¹ Loc. cit.

⁷² Hutton, op. cit., p. 168.

France was familiar with the interdict. It was a very severe punishment, for in medieval times the importance of church functions and the services of the clergy were stressed, and such functions and services were intimately connected with the spiritual welfare of the Christian and even his eternal salvation. In The Cambridge Medieval History we are told of the reaction of the French clergy, which varied among the clergymen:

At first, acquiescence was general, but soon the French clergy were strangely divided, and while some bishops, including the Archbishop of Sens and the Bishop of Paris, braved the displeasure of the king and the temporary alienation from their sees, many rallied to him.⁷³

The marriage between Philip and Agnes had been declared illegal, and Philip had to put her away. Not much later, in July 1201, Agnes died. Innocent showed his diplomacy and tact by legitimizing the children of Philip and Agnes after her death.⁷⁴

Philip yielded to the extent that he took back Ingeborg. But he did not restore to her the full rights and privileges of wifehood. Soon he accused her of sorcery, and claimed that she bewitched him. Furthermore, he induced her to retire to a convent, and he now declared that the marriage must be dissolved because she had taken monastic vows. Innocent refused to pronounce a dissolution of the marriage without a full investigation.⁷⁵ Philip was so insistent in his attempts to get rid of Ingeborg that he seemed to stop at nothing. In this controversy, neither Innocent III nor Philip Augustus seemed to gain the upper hand. It was a draw.

The two men also clashed on another matter: the request of Innocent that Philip send an army to put down the Albigensian crusade in France. Philip refused on the grounds that he could see a greater gain in a victory over the Albigensians for the papacy than for the crown of France. He worked things out in such a way as not to incur the hatred of the Pope to any great extent. Hutton describes Philip as follows:

He held out against the head of the Catholic world on a moral question with a diplomacy which kept the papal curia itself at bay. And, without taking part in a crusade which lay near to the heart of the great ruler of the Church, he managed not to incur his censure, and eventually reaped all the rewards of the expedition.⁷⁶

Perhaps the chief reason for the difference between the success of Pope Innocent III against King John of England and King Philip Augustus of France lies in the feeling of the nobles in each country toward their ruler. With very few exceptions, the

⁷³ The Cambridge Medieval History, loc. cit.

⁷⁴ Hutton, op. cit., p. 173.

⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 176.

⁷⁶ Ibid., pp. 196 f.

nobility was strongly opposed to John. On the other hand, Philip found much support among the nobility.

In his dealings with the rulers of two of the leading nations of his time, then, Innocent met with different fortunes. He won a distinct victory over John, as he did in the case of many other rulers. On the other hand, he won no decisive victory over Philip. In fact, it is hard to say which of the two men won. After this discussion, we shall take up the controversies between Innocent and Sverre.

(To Be Continued)

The Need for a Revision of the Explanation of Luther's Catechism

Comments on Question 257 and Commandments 7, 9, and 10.

by Nils C. Oesleby

Question 257. Why has Jesus taught us to pray for our bread? Jesus had taught us to pray for our bread, because he would have us desire to support ourselves by honest industry, and to avoid living on the labor of others.

Gen. 3:19. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat thy bread.

2 Thess. 3:11-12. We hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies. Now them that are such we command and exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread. 'Explanation' editions of 1905, 1924, and 1939. The 1955 edition omits the emphasis on the word "our!"

Comments: The reading, "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat thy bread," is supported by the LXX Greek, by Wiclif in English, and by Luther in German. "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread," is supported by the Massoretic Hebrew, by the Authorized Version, the American Revised Version, the English Revised Version and the Revised Standard Version.

The Large Catechism does not at this place (Fourth Petition) discuss honesty and ownership, but rather that a permanent and peaceful government gives man the opportunity to eat the bread for which he has labored.

The question "Why has Jesus taught us to pray for our bread?" is superfluous. The question has already been asked in another form, namely qu. 244. "Why should we say Our Father?," and answered "the children of God should pray with and for one another-Intercessory prayer."

An old proverb says, "He who does not work for his bread robs his neighbor; he who does not pray for his bread robs God." Prayer belongs under the fourth Petition. Work belongs under the seventh commandment.

The Seventh Commandment: Thou shalt not steal. We should fear and love God that we may not take our neighbor's money or property but help him to improve and protect his property and living!

Comments: The word "property" includes money, goods, land, and living creatures which serve man. Only the first two of these categories should be considered under

the Seventh Commandment. Luther does this, using the phrase "Geld oder Gut" in German, and "pecuniam aut bona" in Latin. (See also the Large Catechism.) We should understand "goods" to mean inanimate objects which have been improved by the labor of man. Ephesians 4: 28 "Let him that stole, steal no more but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth."

Not only sins of word and deed, but also sins of desire are forbidden by the Seventh Commandment (C. P. H. 1943 Catechism, qu. 66, N. P. H. 1956 Catechism qu. 99.)

Therefore it would be in harmony with the Word of God and our Confessions to say, "We should fear and love God that we may not take nor desire to take our neighbor's money or goods, nor get it by false ware or dealing, but help him to improve and protect his goods and living."

The Ninth Commandment: Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house. We should fear and love God, that we may not craftily seek to gain our neighbor's inheritance or home, nor get it by a show of right, but help and serve him in keeping it.

Comments: Luther's German for "inheritance or home" is "Erbe oder Hause." His Latin is "hereditatem vel domum." In English it would be preferable to use "inheritance or house" as in C. P. H. 1943 and N. P. H. 1956.

The word "house" means something more than four walls and a roof, yet not entirely "anything that belongs to our neighbor" as in C. P. H. 1943, qu. 70 and N. P. H. 1956 qu. 108.

In the Bible we find the word "house" in such passages as Luke 2:4, "Jeseph was of the house and lineage of David;" and Isaiah 38:1 "Set thine house in order; for thou shalt die, and not live." (See also Matt. 23:38, 2 Sam. 17:23, Genesis 9:27.) In the small Catechism, Luther has most wonderfully introduced the word "inheritance" as a synonym and definition of "house".

"Inheritance or house" has both temporal and eternal significance. John 14:1 "In my father's house are many mansions," Ephesians 5:5 "no covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God."

The word "field" follows "house" in the Hebrew and Greek text of Deuteronomy 5:21 and in the Greek Text of Exodus 20:17. This is reflected in the Large Catechism in the definition of inheritance or house, namely "house and estate, land, meadows;" :a large inheritance, real estate, etc.;" :a castle, city, duchy, or any other great thing." Land is also included in the Biblical references to "inheritance or house." In Numbers 26:53 "Unto thee shall be divided for an inheritance;" and 1 Kings 21:1-3 where Naboth's vineyard is referred to as his inheritance. In Luke 12:13-16 "And one of the company said unto him, Master, speak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me. And he said unto him,

Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you? And he said unto them, Take heed, and beware of covetousness; for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth. And he spake a parable unto them, saying, The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully." In Hebrews 11:8-10 "By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went. By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise; For he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God."

The Ninth Commandment forbids the sin of desire, It specifically mentions desire. Therefore Romans 7:7. "I had not known sin, but by the law; for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." In the New Testament we see that "He that hateth his brother is a murderer" and "Whoso looketh on a woman to lust after her hath already committed adultery with her in his heart." 1 John 3:15; Matt. 5:28. But already in the Old Testament in the prohibition of covetousness, it is taught that the desire to sin is also sin.

The Ninth Commandment forbids also the sin of word and deed, not only to seek to get, but also the very getting and the holding of that which is unlawfully gotten.

Therefore it would be in harmony with the Word of God and our Confessions to say, "We should fear and love God, that we may not craftily seek to get our neighbor's inheritance, nor get it with a show of right, but help and serve him in keeping it.

The Tenth Commandment: Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his cattle, nor anything that is his. We should fear and love God, that we may not estrange, force or entice away from our neighbor his wife, servants, or cattle, but urge them to stay and do their duty.

Comments: The phrase "anything that is his" can be understood in a wider sense and in a narrower sense. In the wider sense, it would signify all the property or possessions of the neighbor, namely, land, goods, money and the service of living creatures. But - the consideration of money and goods belongs under the seventh commandment, and the consideration of land belongs under the ninth commandment. In the narrower sense, the phrase "anything that is his" can be understood as meaning "et cetera" or "And so forth", Konrad Dietrich in "Institutiones" as quoted by D. Meibohm in "The Difference between the Ninth and the Tenth Commandments" Lehre U. Wehre, July 1915, CP.H. St. Louis, says that the phrase "anything that is his" means "other kinds of the same class as those named," such as the man, the son, the daughter, the calf, the steer, the pig, the hog, or the goose."

As the ninth commandment, so also the tenth commandment forbids the sin of desire, and this is worthy of emphasis.

It is important to note that the words of the Catechism, "estrangle, force and entice" are words of action. It is incorrect to limit our understanding of this commandment to "desire." Action is also indicated by Luther in the Large Catechism when he writes, "in such a case where one by some stratagem takes away a rich bride from another," and "It is not a rare thing with us that one estranges or alienates another's man-servant or maid-servant, or entices them away by flattering words."

Book Review

"Revelation and the Bible," by Carl F. H. Henry, Baker Book, Grand Rapids 6, Mich.. Price \$6.00. (Order from the Synod Book Store, B. L. C. Mankato.)

This 413 page volume is described as a "Symposium of Contemporary Evangelical Thought" on "the crucial subject in today's theological debate, the authority of Scripture." Twenty-four international scholars, most of whom belong to the Dutch Reformed Church in Holland and America, but including also one Lutheran, Dr. J. T. Mueller of St. Louis, give the evangelical view of such phases of the subject as revelation, inspiration, the canon, interpretation, archaeological confirmation, Biblical criticism, the Unity of the Bible, etc, taking into account particularly the "Neo orthodox" and "de-mythologizing" schools of thought. We may not agree with all the writers on every statement or phase of their presentations. But we must recommend the book highly to our pastors and to all who take an intelligent interest in Theology, since it is the best answer yet available to the modern attacks on Scripture as the inspired word of God. Now that the doctrine of Verbal Inspiration is being attacked even within would be "conservative Lutheran" circles, it is necessary for true Christians to arm themselves with the Biblical answers to the many insidious perversions of fundamental doctrines which are being advocated as the "last word" in modern "scientific" thought on the Bible. "This volume is an indispensable tool for every minister and theological student who sincerely seeks to keep abreast of the currents of relevant Christian thought. It is for the alert church member who is eager to honor Christ as the center and end of all knowledge." With this we concur.

G. O. L.

-----*****-----

From the Editors

The poll of our pastors taken during the month of June, regarding the name of our publication, hitherto called "Clergy Bulletin", had the following results:

For:	"Synod Theological Magazine"	7 votes
"	"Lutheran Synod Quarterly"	25 "
"	"Lutheran Theological Journal"	11 "

Accordingly, we are calling this, the fourth issue, "The Lutheran Synod Quarterly." We trust that this name will prove to be distinctive and properly descriptive, and thus satisfactory to all.