



Lutheran Synod Quarterly

A STUDY OF GALATIANS 6, 6
Prof. M. H. Otto

WHAT IS OUR RULE FOR DETERMINING THE
ORTHODOXY OF A CHURCH BODY?
Rev. A. M. Harstad

THE MEANING AND USE OF THE GREEK NEW
TESTAMENT CRITICAL APPARATUS
Rev. Julian Anderson

BOOK REVIEW
Prof. B. W. Teigen

THE CLC ON "CHURCH FELLOWSHIP"
Rev. Theodore Aaberg

LUTHERAN SYNOD QUARTERLY

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

Edited by the Theological Faculty of the ELS Theological Seminary

George O. Lillegard, Editor-in-Chief, % Bethany Lutheran College, Mankato, Minn.

Volume II, Number IV

(Published Quarterly)

June, 1962

Subscription Price: \$1.50 per year

Single Copy, 50¢

A STUDY OF GALATIANS 6, 6

The Scripture word here treated occurs in the Standard Epistle text for the 15th Sunday after Trinity. It is a familiar passage to all who have been brought up on Luther's Small Catechism, since it is listed as one of the proof-texts in his Table of Duties, under the heading "What The Hearers Owe Their Pastors". The verse has been translated from the Greek thus by Luther: "Der unterrichtet wird mit dem Wort, der teile mit allerlei Gutes dem, der ihn unterrichtet." The King James Version, which is fairly representative of other translations, such as Young, Berkley, New English Bible, and Philipps, reads, "Let him that is taught in the word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things."

According to these translations the Apostle was instructing his readers on what they owed their teachers in the Word, that in return for the instruction received his readers should share their earthly possessions with their teachers. There are passages elsewhere in Scripture which speak of the God-ordained way in which laborers in the Vineyard are to be supported, such as I Cor. 9, 11.14; I Tim. 5, 17f; Luke 10, 8; so, no doctrine is undermined, no truth is lost, if this passage were to be translated differently, which we believe the original Greek not only permits but also demands.

If one were to use even the small Liddel and Scott dictionary he will discover a word in the Greek, the meaning of which has not been fully reproduced in the above translations -- it is the word koinoonein. Yet, the literal and first meaning of this word fits in very well with the context and contains an especially noble thought that should make this passage even more meaningful to us. In fact, it is a thought which enriches the whole context in which this verse is found.

If the traditional translation is to obtain, we find that it is introducing a thought that is somewhat foreign to the text as a whole. The last thing Paul was concerned about when writing to the Galatians was this matter of support for the laborers in the Word. His reason for writing them was their doctrinal aberrations, their going back to the Ceremonial Law for their hope for justification before God. In Chapter 3, verse 1, he says, "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth."

If correctly translated this verse in chapter 6 would give full impetus to the

real object he had in mind -- to show them how to live in the new liberty where-
with Christ had made them free and how they might better learn to do that. He want-
ed to make them certain of the truth so that, in the words addressed to the Ephesian
Christians, the Galatians would "henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro,
and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning
craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive." (Eph. 4, 14) To clarify what we
mean let us take the Greek text itself and work out from that.

The passage itself is simple in its grammatical and linguistical form:
Koinooneítoō de ho katechoumenos ton logon tou katechounti en pasin agathois.
There is no doubt as to the form of the verbs or the construction. Koinooneítoō
(from koinoonéoo) is the present imperative third person singular, translated, "let
him communicate unto," in the Authorized Version. Because of the peculiar way
in which the Apostle Paul uses it, elsewhere, too, to give added emphasis to his
presentations, it has been given a meaning it does not originally have. Properly
translated this verse would read: "Let him who is taught in the word become (or,
make himself) a sharer of (or, be a partaker with) him that teaches in all good",
(supplying "things").

Naturally we expect some proof for that. The first meaning of koinoonéoo
is "to be a partaker, be a sharer of, take part in". And so the apostle consistent-
ly uses it, as we shall endeavor to show.

Following Thayer's lexicon in which we find listed every reference to the
Greek New Testament in which this word is used, we find two uses of this word:

A. koinoonéoo - meaning "to come into communion, or fellowship, to be
made a partaker. "

1) So it is used in Heb. 2, 14 (with the genitive of the thing): épeí ouñ ta
paidia kekoinooneken haimatos kai sarkos, translated, "forasmuch then as the
children are partakers of flesh and blood, etc." in the Authorized version, which
is correct. Nothing about giving, but instead, of Christ's partaking in or sharing
the flesh and blood of men.

2) So it is used in Rom. 15, 27 (with the dative of the thing): eí gar tois
pneumatikois autoon ekoinooneesan ta ethnē, translated, "for if the Gentiles
have been made partakers (intrans.) of their spiritual things", in the King James
Version, which is correct. Again, nothing about giving, but sharing in the spir-
itual blessings of the Jews.

3) So it is used in I Peter 4, 13 (dative): állá kathò koinoneíte tois tou
Christou pathēmasin chairete, translated in our Bibles, "rejoice, inasmuch as ye
are partakers of Christ's sufferings," which is correct. Nothing about giving, but
sharing in, being a partaker with something Christ has or suffered.

B. koinoonéoo - meaning "to enter into fellowship, join one's self as
an associate, make one's self a sharer or partner. "

1) So it is used in I Tim. 5, 22 (with dative of the thing): meedè koinoonei
hamartiais allotriais, in the accepted translation, "neither be partakers of other
men's sins," which is correct. Not giving, but partaking or sharing in the guilt
that is originally someone else's.

2) So it is used in 2 John 11 (with dative of the thing): ho légoon gar autoō
chairein koinoonei tois ergois autoū tois poneerois, translated thus in our version,
"For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds", which is correct;

("him" being the one who brings in false doctrine) nothing about giving again, but becoming a partner in another man's guilt.

3) So it is used in Rom. 12, 13 (with the dative of person): taís chreíais tōon haqíoon koinoonōntes, for which the King James version has "distributing to the necessity of the saints." That is what the Apostle had in mind, but that is not quite what he says nor the way he says it. Literally that verse reads "become partakers of, partners in, sharers of, the necessities of the saints", the same as in Rom. 15, 27, where our versions translate correctly (Cf. under "A 2"). Paul's way of speaking here is a circumlocution, by which he says the Christians at Rome should do something about the need of the saints. He does not say that they are merely to help the needy saints, but "make their need your need, become sharers of their need", which is far more forceful and in full harmony with Scripture in general, as for example, the 2nd verse of Galatians six, "bear ye one another's"; or Phil. 2, 4: "Look not every one on his own things, but every man also on the things of others." So Thayer correctly says, "make another's necessities one's own as to relieve them." Still, in the literal sense of the word there is nothing about giving, but about making oneself a partner of, sharer in, what another person has.

So it is used in Phil. 4, 15 (with dative of person, followed by eis ti): oudemia moi ekkleesiá ekoinōoneesen eis lógon dōseos kai léempeos ei mēe humeís mónoi, for which the Authorized Version has "no church communicated with me as concerning giving and receiving but ye only." Literally, it would read, "not one church shared with me the word concerning giving and receiving but only you." The verb ekoinōoneesen does not refer to giving at all, but to sharing the word concerning giving. The Philippians were the only ones who accepted that word and did something about it; they brought an offering.

So it is used in Gal. 6, 6 (followed by en with dative of thing which he shares with another -- not important here): koinōoneitoo de ho kateechoúmenos tōn lógon tōo kateechounti en pāsín agathois. The traditional translation has been, "Let him that is taught in the word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things." While all the other passages, correctly or incorrectly translated in our versions, have "communicate with", or its equivalent, we here read "communicate unto". Why this change? Very likely translators wanted to interpret, too, but instead misinterpreted. Taking the words as they stand, one has to translate, "Let him who is taught in the word make a sharer (or, partner) with him that teaches in all good things," that is, become a partner or sharer in the good things the teacher has; the teachers and the Galatians should not be satisfied with just the ordinary and regular teaching of the Word but seek to make themselves sharers of all the good things the teacher has. In other words, there is nothing about giving here either but about receiving, sharing in something another person has.

When so translated, verses seven and eight have real meaning, "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting." He whose main interest is in satisfying the desires of his flesh, who neglects the interests of his soul, who is satisfied with getting the barest essentials for his soul, not making full use of his instructor, not getting all he can from his teacher, that person is not sowing to his spirit and its temporal and eternal welfare; -- he is, because of his indifference and self-satisfied complacency, sowing to his flesh, and God, Whom he has not been interested in listening to, is not going to be mocked at the final accounting.

No, the one taught should seek to get all he can for his soul and spiritual life from his teacher. He should not just wait for his teacher to come to him, passively to receive what his teacher has to offer, but he ought also to go to his

teacher for furthering the interests of his spirit, so that by sowing to it he may reap life everlasting.

The argument is advanced that Barnabas has used the word koinooneoo in the same way as the King James Version does in this verse. So it seems, but there is no evidence that it has such a meaning in any of the expressions of Paul in the New Testament, as just shown.

Dr. Lenski in The Epistle Selections of The Ancient Church (p. 735) has come to the same conclusion regarding this sixth verse of Galatians six, saying, "a number of writers . . . understand Paul to mean that the pupil is to pay his teacher, the congregation is to share its material wealth with its minister. Paul says the opposite: the pupil is to have fellowship and part in the spiritual good things, in the spiritual wealth of his teacher."

He translates this verse thus, "Let him who is being instructed in the Word fellowship with the one instructing him in all good things," and then makes this comment, which because of its brevity is worthy of being included here: "So the admonition is to the effect that every pupil fellowship in all the good things with his instructor, that he let none of them slip by. Koinoonein always means 'to fellowship', and the noun means 'fellowship'. 'All good things' are im Sinne von heilbringend, αγαθός, soteriological, -- not money or material things. The teacher has the wealth, and the pupil is to fellowship the teacher in regard to this wealth, the Word. There are disagreeable burdens in which we are to fellowship the brethren. Thank God there is also the Word with its delights, in which we may fellowship our teachers. Paul is referring especially to himself as the teacher of the Galatians. Paul never taught for money; the Judaizers were greedy for money. (2 Cor. 1, 20)" (736)

So a pastor's aim today is none other than to have others partake of the Gospel blessings which have been committed into his trust, to make them partakers of the many blessings and benefits that are to be found in the Gospel of grace. And this sixth verse of Galatians six urges the Christians so to fellowship their pastor, so to make themselves partakers of the benefits, the spiritual good things he has to offer and to dispense. They should go to him, eager to obtain all the instruction, information, and comfort and hope that their pastor has to give. Nor will anyone deny that our people need such admonition, such encouraging, for we all must admit that they could seek to make themselves sharers of the many good things, we ourselves enjoy, far more than they do. Here is a Word of God, when rightly interpreted, that will show them that it is God's will that they so seek after the interests of their souls. Let us preach and apply it.

Perhaps a brief glance at the substantive form koinoonia will also help us to come to a final definite conclusion on the use of this word. Thayer lists three different uses, in the first two of which he is correct; the general meaning given is, "fellowship, association, community, communion, joint participation, intercourse."

1) "the share which one has in anything, participation" (with the genitive of the thing in which he shares), and so used in the following passages:

Phil. 2, 1: "If there be any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit . . . fulfill ye my joy."

2 Cor. 13, 14: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all."

Phil. 3, 10: "That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and

the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death."

Philemon 6: "That the communication of thy faith may become effectual by the acknowledging of every good thing which is in you by Christ Jesus."

I Cor. 10, 16: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ . . . "

2 Cor. 8, 4: "Praying us with much entreaty, that we would receive the gift, and take upon us the fellowship of the ministering to the saints." (re the desire of the Macedonian Christians with respect to their offerings)

I Cor. 1, 9: "God is faithful, by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord."

Eph. 3, 9: "And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ."

2) "intercourse, fellowship, intimacy", as in:

Gal. 2, 9: ". . . they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship."

2 Cor. 6, 14: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what (fellowship) hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?"

Acts 2, 42: "And they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in the breaking of bread and in prayers."

Phil. 1, 4.5: ". . . making request with joy, For your fellowship in the Gospel from the first day until now."

I John 1, 3.6.7: "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father . . . "

"If we say we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness . . . "

"But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another . . . "

3) "a benefaction jointly contributed, a collection, a contribution", with which definition, at least as to the passages in which it is said to be so used, we do not agree.

2 Cor. 8, 4: (see above)

2 Cor. 9, 13: ". . . they glorify God . . . for your liberal distribution unto them, and unto all men."

Romans 15, 26, the last reference cited by Thayer, is translated thus in the

Authorized Version, "for it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain contribution for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem." Literally it would read, "pleased them to make a sharing (or, participation) with the poor saints at Jerusalem"; it was a collection, as a result of their sharing the need of the Jerusalemites, yes, but that is not the meaning of the word koinoonian. Stoeckhardt calls it a collection, too, yet really only as to the result of their fellowship or sharing. He is right when saying "Der Beisteurnder tritt in Gemeinschaft mit dem unterstuetzten", as in Romans 12, 3, (the contributor enters into fellowship with the one supported).

So also Heb. 13, 16: "but to do good and to communicate forget not", though it should read "but doing good and sharing (supl. 'of burdens and needs') do not neglect."

Perhaps this seems to be a revolutionary twist to a passage that has been so ingrained in us in its traditional meaning that we hate to give it up. Yet, the literal meaning of this word koinoneeo and its use throughout the New Testament force us to come to this conclusion that Galatians six, verse six has to be translated, "Let him that is taught in the Word make himself a sharer with him that teacheth in all good things," i.e., a sharer of what the teacher has. Look at the connotation it has for us and our hearers, a thought, a truth, expressed most beautifully and appealingly. With all due respect for the translation that has been customarily accepted, all the evidence seems to point in favor of the rendition given above, which not only contains a wonderful word of instruction, but also makes the whole context more meaningful. A study of all the uses of this word in the New Testament can lead to no other conclusion.

SOLI DEO GLORIA!

-- M. H. Otto

* * * * *

WHAT IS OUR RULE FOR DETERMINING THE ORTHODOXY OF A CHURCH BODY?

(Read at the General Pastoral Conference of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod at Mankato, Minn., April 26, 1962, by the Rev. Adolph M. Harstad, Watertown, Wis.)

Introduction

Purity of doctrine is not something just to have and to hold. It is not a thing the mere having of which saves without the heart being in it. Neither is it something which we are to be satisfied to have just for ourselves without concern for others. It is a thing about which we are to be vitally concerned to bring it to others.

There was a young man who was much interested in tinkering with antique cars. He repaired them and made them run. But he never went anywhere with them. At last someone said to him, "Why don't you take one of the cars out on the road and go somewhere with it?" And the young man answered, "No, I just like to hear the motor purr along, but I don't care to go anywhere with it."

It should not be that way as regards the pure doctrine, that we are only interested to hear it "purr along", and don't care to go anywhere with it.

Jesus had the pure doctrine. Was He content just to have it for Himself?

No, indeed. He wanted it preached from the housetops.

Let us also remember that the First Petition of the Lord's Prayer, in which we ask for pure teaching, is followed immediately by the Second Petition in which we ask that this pure teaching may be spread in the earth.

The purpose of God's Word is that we should learn from it to believe in Christ unto our salvation.

It is told that in a certain city a group of men were seen looking into a window in which a picture was on display. Suddenly one of the men exclaimed, "I have seen Him!" The picture consisted of ink spots arranged in such a manner that when one looked carefully one could see the face of Christ. And above the picture were the words: "For you to see the face of Christ is our hope." God's Word would bring it about so that we see Christ and may say, "I have seen Him who is my Hope."

We are not to forget that there are Christians and heirs of salvation also in other fellowships. However, this does not mean that we may be careless as regards our church affiliation, for God has made it our duty to adhere to the pure teaching only.

Perhaps a warning needs also to be sounded lest we make Romans 16, 17 the centre of our doctrine. Rather, John 3, 16 is the centre. The doctrine of justification is the central doctrine of Scripture.

We now proceed to the question before us in this paper: What is the rule by which we can determine when an historically orthodox church body has become heterodox?

I.

We have the answer in very brief form in Pieper's Christian Dogmatics, Vol. III, p. 423, as follows: "A church body loses its orthodoxy only when it no longer applies Rom. 16, 17, hence does not combat and eventually remove the false doctrine, but tolerates it without reproof and thus actually grants it equal right with the truth."

But we wish also to quote the paragraphs immediately preceding this statement to show how Dr. Pieper arrives at this conclusion. We read in Christian Dogmatics, Vol. III, pp. 422 and 423 as follows:

"Congregations and church bodies must be divided into two classes according to their public doctrine.

"It is God's will and command that in His Church His Word be preached and believed in purity and truth, without adulteration. In God's Church nobody should utter his own, but only God's Word (I Peter 4, 11). Chaff and wheat do not belong together. All 'teaching otherwise', heterodidaskalein, is strictly forbidden. I Tim. 1, 3: 'As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine.' It is important to point out again and again that in all Scripture there is not a single text permitting a teacher to deviate from the Word of God or granting a child of God license to fraternize with a teacher who deviates from the Word of God. God is against the prophets who proclaim their own dreams (Jer. 23, 31 f.). And all Christians without exception are commanded to avoid such. (Rom. 16, 17; I Tim. 6, 3 ff.).

"The distinction between orthodox and heterodox church bodies and congregations is based on this divine order. A congregation or church body which abides by God's order, in which therefore God's Word is taught in its purity and the Sacraments administered according to the divine institution, is properly called an orthodox church (*ecclesia orthodoxa, pura*). But a congregation or church body which, in spite of the divine order, tolerates false doctrine in its midst is properly called a heterodox church (*ecclesia heterodoxa, impura*). All children of God should be earnestly concerned to see how real and serious this difference between the church bodies is, because indifference as to the Christian doctrine is rampant today among professed Christians, and the 'abrogation of creeds' and substitution for them of a so-called 'applied Christianity' is represented as the goal the Church should strive for.

"With regard to the orthodox character of a church body note well: (1) A church body is orthodox only if the true doctrine, as we have it in the Augsburg Confession and the other Lutheran Symbols, is actually taught in its pulpits and its publications and not merely 'officially' professed as its faith. Not the 'official doctrine', but the actual teaching determines the character of a church body, because Christ enjoins that all things whatsoever He has commanded His disciples should actually be taught and not merely acknowledged in an 'official document' as the correct doctrine. It is patent that faith in Christ will be created and preserved through the pure Gospel only when that Gospel is really proclaimed. (2) A church body does not forfeit its orthodox character by reason of the casual intrusion of false doctrine. The thing which the Apostle Paul told the elders of Ephesus: 'Also of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them' (Acts 20, 30), came true not only in the Apostolic Church, but also in the Church of the Reformation and will occur in the Church to the Last Day. A church body loses its orthodoxy only WHEN IT NO LONGER APPLIES ROM. 16, 17, HENCE DOES NOT COMBAT AND EVENTUALLY REMOVE THE FALSE DOCTRINE, BUT TOLERATES IT WITHOUT REPROOF AND THUS ACTUALLY GRANTS IT EQUAL RIGHT WITH THE TRUTH. "

The following paragraph of the "Brief Statement" is also pertinent here:

Paragraph 29. "The orthodox character of a church is established not by its mere name nor by its outward acceptance of, and subscription to, an orthodox creed, but by the doctrine which is ACTUALLY taught in its pulpits, in its theological seminaries, and in its publications. On the other hand, a church does not forfeit its orthodox character through the casual intrusion of errors, provided these are combated and eventually removed by means of doctrinal discipline, Acts 20, 30; I Tim. 1, 3. "

II.

The question needs to be answered whether also an error in a non-fundamental doctrine or doctrines is cause for breaking fellowship with a church body.

By way of answer to this question we shall quote a portion of an essay by Dr. C. F. W. Walther which appeared first in Lehre und Wehre of 1868 under the title, "Die falschen Stuetzen der modernen Theorie von den offenen Fragen", and then was translated into English and appeared in the Concordia Theological Monthly of 1939 in instalments from April to November. The translation is partly by Dr. W. Arndt and partly by Prof. A. Guebert. It has the heading: "The False Arguments for the Modern Theory of Open Questions." We quote from the April issue, p. 261 f, as follows:

"It is certain that, since all Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is

profitable, the Church may not adulterate or eliminate anything contained in Holy Scripture but must earnestly hold every Biblical truth, even if it should appear insignificant, oppose every unscriptural error, should it seem ever so unimportant.

"How is that? we are asked. Do you really wish to excommunicate everybody at once as a heretic who errs in nothing but a non-fundamental article, and do you intend at once to sever fellowship with an organization which is guilty of such a non-fundamental error? That we are far removed from entertaining such a thought we have stated above. What we maintain is this: On the one hand, a non-fundamental error, even if it is contrary to the clear Word of God, must not be treated as a heresy, but in patient instruction it must be shown to be untenable, be refuted, opposed, and criticized. On the other hand, however, if a church has exhausted all means of bringing such an erring brother to the acknowledgment of the truth and his adherence to the respective error evidently is not due to insufficient intellectual understanding of Scripture-teaching and hence through this non-fundamental error it becomes manifest that he consciously, stubbornly, and obstinately contradicts the divine Word and that accordingly through his error he subverts the organic foundation of faith (the Scriptures), then such an erring person, like all others that persevere in mortal sins, must no longer be borne with, but fraternal relations with him must be terminated. The same thing applies to a whole church-body which errs in a non-fundamental doctrine. It is very true that in this life absolute unity in faith and doctrine is not possible, and no higher unity than a fundamental one can be attained. This, however, by no means implies that in a church-body errors of a non-fundamental nature which become manifest and which contradict the clear Word of God must not be attacked and that a Church can be regarded as a true church and be treated as such if it either makes such non-fundamental errors a part of its confession and, with injury to the organic foundation, in spite of all admonition, stubbornly clings to these errors or in a unionistic fashion and in a spirit of indifference insists that a deviation from God's clear Word in such points need be of no concern to us."

Farther on in this translation we read, May, 1939, p. 352 f: "The time for separating from brethren on account of an error which doctrinally is non-fundamental has only then arrived when those who are erring stubbornly reject all instruction from the divine Word and thus become manifest as people who, though they apparently do not wish to violate the dogmatic foundation, the analogy of faith, nevertheless shake and subvert the organic foundation, Holy Scripture itself, as far as they are concerned."

Luther is quoted on p. 356 as follows: "Christian doctrine does not belong to us, but to God, who has made us merely its servants and ministers; hence we cannot drop, or yield the smallest tittle or letter of it." (Comments on Gal. 5, 9)

III.

We here present certain quotations from eminent teachers that show what patience is required in the matter of restoring doctrinal unity.

Dr. C.F.W. Walther says the following (as quoted in English translation in the Concordia Theol. Monthly, 1940, p. 298; original in the Lehre und Wehre of 1868):

"Even if an individual member of the Church becomes guilty of an error which violates a clear word of God, such error does not at once deprive the respective person of ecclesiastical, fraternal, or intimate fellowship."

Dr. Franz Pieper says (Essay on Unionism, Proceedings of the Oregon and

Washington District, 1924, p. 27; translated by Dr. Engelder in C.T.M., Dec., 1943, p. 834):

"The proper and God-pleasing way to treat the Christians' weakness in doctrine and knowledge is to strive to remove this weakness by patiently teaching them the whole truth of God's Word. That is a truly Christian work and we should keep at it in great patience. We must not be quick to discontinue this work, even if it takes longer than we had expected. We keep it up with great patience as long as there is, in our Christian judgment, any prospect and hope of overcoming the error."

Luther writes (St. L. XX, 12, in the first of his eight sermons against Carlstadt, March, 1522):

"We must not forget how God bore with us and manifested patience for a long time when we were weak and even unbelieving. Hence we, too, must practice patience with our neighbor even if he cannot follow us at once and at times stumbles and errs. Hear how God here and there in the Prophets proclaims that He carries His people as a mother carries her child. Isa. 46, 3. . . . This must be our method in dealing with our weak brethren; we must exercise patience for while and bear with their weak faith. . . . We must not bark at them in frightening words, but treat them in friendly fashion and instruct them with gentleness; we do not intend to go to heaven alone; rather endeavor to bring your brother along. Even if these people now are our enemies and do not have the faith in perfection, they will, I trust, become our friends and drop their unbelief."

Again we quote Luther (St. L. IX, 726 ff, from the Interpretation of Galatians):

"They appeal to Gal. 6, 1 and demand that we cover their error with the mantle of charity which believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. . . . They say the matter is not of such importance that on account of this one article Christian unity should be disrupted, which is the choicest treasure of the Church. . . . They charge us with stubbornness, because we will not yield to them by even one hair's breadth and will not tolerate their error. But I would rather have them and the whole world with them leave me and turn against me than that I should leave Christ and have Him turn against me. Christ would turn against me if I turned away from His clear and certain Word to follow their idle dreams and perversions of Christ's words. The One Christ is greater than innumerable many unities in love. . . . Thus Paul bore the weakness and the fall of the Galatians and others whom the false apostles had misled; he looked at their sincere repentance. . . . But he dealt differently with the incorrigible false apostles, who defended their false doctrine and demanded that it be received as the truth; with them he dealt hardly. Gal. 5, 12; 5, 10; 1, 8."

IV.

We quote, in translation, from an essay in the Report of the Iowa District of the former Norwegian Synod, 1877, pp. 57, 58, 65, 66. The essay is entitled "Om Splittelse i Kirken", that is, "Of Division in the Church". The author is evidently Dr. F. A. Schmidt who in 1877 still adhered to the right paths.

"When such arise who cause divisions and offences, and the fruits of dissension show themselves, we should follow the Apostle Paul's admonition, Rom. 16, 17, 18: 'Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.' . . . But one

turns from them when one testifies against them.

"If disunity and controversy arise in an otherwise united, orthodox church body, this is not as it should be. Still it is right on the part of those who take the field against those who depart from the doctrine of God's Word, and such controversy is then necessary just for the restoration of true unity and preservation of the church body. We must always seek to be faithful to the truth in love. It depends on circumstances how long one shall continue to witness without severing outward church connection with those who contradict the truth and do not let themselves be convinced by it. Not carnal zeal nor church politics shall decide, but Christian love and wisdom, so that the instruction of God's Word is carefully followed. Those who depart from the sound doctrine separate themselves and cause the division, even though the orthodox part, after having witnessed for a long time, e.g. in a decadent State Church, go out from it and organize a confessionally true free church.

"Suppose a person is a member of a false-teaching church body and has his eyes opened to the errors that hold sway, is it the idea that he should go his way without further ado?

"No one shall go his way without further ado. It is not enough that he for his own person sees that the church body errs in doctrine; but it is also his duty to hold this forth and witness for them with whom he has stood in brotherhood, so that he does his part to the end that as many of them as possible may come to an understanding of the divine truth and be rescued from the danger to souls which is tied up with continuation under the influence of the corrupting of God's Word, by which poison is given to souls instead of wholesome food. Common love of the neighbor demands this.

"But with regard to how long he shall bear witness without leaving, it is difficult to make a rule that can be followed in every case. It depends a great deal on what opportunity the one concerned has had to learn to know the truth, and how they have conducted themselves. But also we must remember that the First Table has priority over the Second Table. We should love God above all things; and love to God teaches in each case whether love to the neighbor demands that we shall separate ourselves immediately or that we shall continue standing for a longer time."

V.

We now present, in rather free form, the gist of certain things spoken by Dr. Joh. Ylvisaker at the Convention of the Eastern District of the Norwegian Synod in 1892. These things are presented in Norwegian in the Report of said District, 1892, pp. 37 ff. The subject of the essay is: "True and False Lutheranism." (Sand og Falsk Lutherdom)

One who is filled with a truly Lutheran spirit desires unity in the church; not just any kind of unity; not just an outward one, but one that is an inward unity first of all. Note carefully the following passages of Scripture: Rom. 14, 19; 12, 18; 15, 5; 1 Cor. 1, 10; Phil. 2, 1 f; 1 Pet. 3, 8. The true unity is unity in doctrine and in all its articles.

But how about unity in such matters as are truly "Open Questions", such as: The origin of the soul of man, whether by creationism or by traducianism; the perpetual virginity of Mary; whether Judas was present at the institution of the Lord's Supper? The answer is that in such things there need not be unity. There may be differences of opinion in such matters.

Then how about unity in matters that are clearly revealed in Scripture, but are not absolutely necessary to salvation, i. e. unity in non-fundamentals? In such things our forefathers made certain distinctions, as follows: They distinguished between such who lead astray and such who are led astray; between such who stubbornly cling to false doctrine and such who err out of weakness or out of ignorance but are willing to be instructed. Here the saying applies that two may do the same thing, and yet it is not the same.

In the year 1539 Luther wrote about his own condition 20 years earlier, when he was indeed clear in the matter that we are saved by faith alone; but if any one at that time had taught that the state of being a monk or a nun was idolatry or that the Roman Mass was an abomination Luther would gladly have been along in burning him at the stake. He did not see at that time that if faith does it all, then certainly monkery and the Roman Mass could not do it. Thus one may err in doctrine out of weakness. Quenstedt and John Gerhard, f. ex., teach contrary to God's Word and the Lutheran Confessions concerning Sunday; and yet, says Dr. Ylvisaker, if they had been among us, none of us would on that account deny them the hand of fellowship without further ado. Ylvisaker says: We have the sure conviction that they did it out of weakness.

At what time one must cease to deal with one who sins in doctrine as one who is weak, and now consider him as one who is stubborn to whom one must deny church fellowship, is often difficult to decide in practice, and in this matter much wisdom and love are required.

We must distinguish between errorists that arise in a congregation or church body, and such who are outside. It is one thing to break a fellowship, another to establish it. But one must be careful in both cases and remember to let God's Word and Christian love rule. Dr. Ylvisaker says he does not consider it necessary to expand on this matter any further, but he does add that if any one should say that he would bury to the depth of 20 fathoms or more beneath the ground differences in matters that belong to God's revealed truth, then this is a sign of a unionistic spirit that every confessional Lutheran must fight against.

And here we shall close by quoting the last paragraph of Article XI of the Thorough Declaration, as follows:

"From this our explanation, friends and enemies, and therefore every one, may clearly infer that we have no intention of yielding ought of the eternal, immutable truth of God for the sake of temporal peace, tranquility, and unity (which, moreover, is not in our power to do). Nor would such peace and unity, since it is devised against the truth and for its suppression, have any permanency. Still less are we inclined to adorn and conceal a corruption of the pure doctrine and manifest, condemned errors. But we entertain heartfelt pleasure and love for, and are on our part sincerely inclined and anxious to advance that unity according to our utmost power, by which His glory remains to God uninjured, nothing of the divine truth of the Holy Gospel is surrendered, no room is given to the least error, poor sinners are brought to true, genuine repentance, raised up by faith, confirmed in new obedience, and thus justified and eternally saved alone through the sole merit of Christ." Triglot, p. 1095.

* * * * *

THE MEANING AND USE OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT CRITICAL APPARATUS

By Rev. Julian Anderson

Part I

The topic for this paper - "The Meaning And Use of the Greek New Testament Critical Apparatus" - is an assignment which involves two basic questions -- 1) What is the so-called "critical apparatus" of the Greek New Testament; and 2) How is this critical apparatus used?

The first of these questions can be answered very simply and briefly, as follows: The so-called "critical apparatus" (or apparatus criticus) is an arbitrary system of signs and symbols used to designate the various manuscripts, early versions, and patristic quotations which have preserved the text of our Greek New Testament during these past nineteen centuries. This critical apparatus, then, is simply a system of identification - a tool which has been devised to be used by the specialists, called "textual critics", in the science of textual criticism. It may best be stated here, perhaps, that the first New Testament scholar to construct anything that can be considered a "critical apparatus" in the modern sense was J. J. Wettstein, in 1751-2; and that the system of notation which is now currently in use is one developed, out of these older materials, by the American scholar, C. R. Gregory, in 1908. This system, in its details, will be explained later. It may also be noted that the first printed edition of the Greek New Testament to append a critical apparatus in any sense was the third edition of Stephanus, in 1550.

Having thus defined what we call the critical apparatus, we then turn to our second question: How is this critical apparatus used? It is with this question, then, that we shall occupy our attention in the balance of this paper.

In order to discuss intelligently the question of the use of the critical apparatus of the New Testament, it is necessary to discuss to some extent the science of textual criticism as a whole, of which the critical apparatus is such an important tool. As Alexander Souter wrote in his classical book, "The Text and Canon of the New Testament", textual criticism is that science which "seeks, by the exercise of knowledge and trained judgment, to restore the very words of some original document which has perished, and survives only in copies complete or incomplete, accurate or inaccurate, ancient or modern." ¹ As applied to our Greek New Testament, then, textual criticism is that branch of theological discipline which seeks to restore the original text of the various documents in the exact form in which they came from the pens of the inspired writers.

In commenting on this point, however, Vincent Taylor, in his excellent little book, "The Text of the New Testament", warns that the task of the textual critic is exceedingly difficult because of the great mass of material with which he is forced to work. To gain some idea of the magnitude of this task, let it be pointed out that the textual critic of the New Testament is faced with no less than some 13,000 different manuscripts, each of which contains all or some portion of the New Testament text; and that these 13,000 manuscripts require a precise and accurate knowledge of no less than ten different languages, involving all three of the major language families of the world - Semitic, Hamitic, and Indo-European! But even this does not tell the whole story; for in addition to this mountain of material, the critic is

¹Souter, Alexander, The Text and Canon of the New Testament., p. 3.

faced also with hundreds of volumes containing the collected works of the early church fathers, each of which may contain thousands of quotations from the text of the New Testament, each of which, in turn, may be of some significance in the determination of the original text of the New Testament. Complicating the problem still more is the fact that of these thousands of manuscripts and patristic quotations no two have been found to date which agree exactly in every detail! From this it will be seen that the number of so-called "variant readings" with which the textual critic of the New Testament has to deal is almost too great to be counted! Compared with this exceedingly complex situation it may be pointed out that the critical editor of the text of Aeschylus has only about 50 manuscripts to consider; and the editor of Sophocles only about 100; while many of the works of the other classical authors are preserved in only one or two different manuscripts.

Lest the budding textual critic of the New Testament become completely discouraged by the magnitude of his task at the very beginning, however, it must also be pointed out that this tremendous mass of documents, which poses so many problems, also bestows some very distinct blessings and advantages which are lacking to the editors of other classical texts. For one thing, this gigantic number of manuscripts surely means that the original text of our New Testament must somewhere exist - a factor of the greatest importance, indeed. The problem that remains, therefore, is a purely practical one - to so develop the science of textual criticism that by the discovery and application of the right principles and methods that original text may actually be recovered from the mass of evidence.

Before we can proceed any farther, therefore, it will first be necessary to take a somewhat closer look at this mass of manuscripts and other materials with which the text critic is called upon to work - the materials which the so-called "critical apparatus" has been designed to identify. This is naturally the first step in gaining an adequate working knowledge of the critical apparatus. Here we note that all of the evidence with which the science of textual criticism is concerned may be conveniently sub-divided into four categories -- 1) Greek manuscripts; 2) early versions; 3) patristic quotations; and 4) lectionaries. Thus, in the sixteenth edition of Nestle, the designations of the various Greek manuscripts are listed on pages 30-32; the early versions on pages 16-18; and the Fathers on pages 18-19; while the lectionaries have never been included in any critical edition to this date, so far as my knowledge goes, and may, therefore, be omitted entirely from consideration in our present discussion.

Self-evidently, the most important class of evidence with which the text critic must deal are the many Greek manuscripts in which the text of our New Testament has been preserved for posterity. It has been estimated that there are at present somewhat over 4,000 of these ancient documents, all of them being over 400 years old, while some of them date back to the second century of our Christian era, within a generation of the death of the last apostle. It should be pointed out, however, that of this great number of manuscripts only 26 contain the text of the complete New Testament - a fact which seems little short of amazing until it be remembered that the various documents making up our New Testament were written and circulated as individual books in the ancient world. From the history of the canon, in fact, we recall that it was not until the fourth century that there was any such thing as a complete New Testament as we know it today. With one or two notable exceptions, therefore, all of the manuscripts which contain the entire text of the New Testament are of a late date, and of comparatively little importance, textually speaking.

This last observation, moreover, introduces a factor of the very greatest importance in this discussion of the subject of textual criticism, and in our understanding and use of the critical apparatus - that all of our ancient documents are

not of equal value in our endeavor to recover the original text of the New Testament. Indeed, it is this which gives the text critic his first big "break" -- that the number of individual Greek manuscripts which are of any significant value in determining the original text of our New Testament is surprisingly small -- really not more than a few dozen all told; all the rest being of such negligible value that they may be safely disregarded in all but a very few cases.

This being so, the first task which suggests itself to the text critic is perfectly obvious -- namely that each of the manuscripts must first be evaluated to determine its relative value and usefulness. In so doing the text critic will first employ the process known as "collation" -- that is, he will "collate" each separate manuscript, or compare it with all the other known manuscripts, tabulating all places in which the manuscript in question presents a reading differing from any of the others -- its so-called "variant" readings.

Having thus completed this first step of collation, which is, of course, a gigantic task and far beyond the powers of any individual critic, the second task of the text critic is to seek to correct each manuscript -- that is, to identify and eliminate its peculiar errors. In this process the text critic seeks to determine which of the variant readings of each manuscript are due to obvious errors which have crept into the text in its transmission through the years; and, having thus eliminated all these, to discover a certain residue of variants which may represent the original text, or help in its recovery by comparison with the other manuscripts. Here also, the task of the text critic is not an overly difficult or impossible one, for almost all of the errors which are in any way discoverable fall into a few well-defined and more-or-less easily recognizable classes.

The first type of errors to be sought for -- and the easiest to discover -- are the so-called "un-intentional" errors -- those which have crept into the text as the result of a "slip" of the eye, the ear, or the hand of the copyist. Here it must be recalled that all of the documents here being dealt with are "manuscripts" -- that is, hand-written documents, bearing in mind that before the invention of printing (@ 1450 A.D.) all documents of a so-called "literary" nature had, by necessity, to be copied laboriously by hand. In most cases, probably, the scribe worked alone, with his original, or "exemplar," sitting on the desk before him, from which he read a word, or a few words, or a line, at a time, and then transcribed as he did so. There were cases, however, where a number of copies would be produced simultaneously, with one person reading the text of the exemplar aloud, while a number of scribes transcribed the text as they heard it read. In the former case the errors would be such as would result from the slip of the eye or the hand in copying; while in the latter case there would be the additional possibility of errors resulting from a slip in pronunciation on the part of the reader, or faulty hearing on the part of the copyist, mistaking one sound for another. At any rate, all of these purely transcriptional, or mechanical, errors have been duly classified, and may be more or less easily identified.

Errors of the eye have been found to be of a three-fold nature -- 1) haplography, where a word, or letter, is written once, when the original has it twice (ἀλλήν for ἀλλήν ἀλλήν); 2) dittography, the opposite mistake of copying a word or letter twice where the original has it only once; and 3) homoioteleuton, where a word -- or sometimes a whole phrase, or whole line -- is omitted because of a similarity of endings (cf., e.g., Luke 3: 1). Almost all of the errors of the ear, on the other hand, are summed up under the common designation of itacism, and consist of various kinds of mis-spellings, arising from faulty pronunciation, or a confusion of one sound for another. Some of these mis-spellings, in turn, may involve a confusion in the area of grammar, mistaking one form for another (cf. Romans 5: 1, or τοῦ for τῷ, etc.). All such errors were identified at a very early date as incidences of itacism because of the great fondness in the Koine Greek for the sound of the letter iota (ι),

with the result that this sound was most often involved in one way or another. (Modern Greek, it might be observed, has continued this tendency to an even more pronounced degree, with the sound of the letter ϵ having replaced all sorts of other vowels and diphthongs).

Having thus uncovered and identified all of these discoverable un-intentional errors in any manuscript, the text critic will then attempt to determine which of the remaining variant readings can be accounted for on the basis that they represent changes or variations introduced into the text intentionally by some ancient copyist. This type of error is, in most cases, much more difficult to recognize, and is in all cases much more difficult to prove, involving in all cases a considerable amount of subjective judgment, and often a rare sense of almost intuitive perception found only in the most highly trained and skillful textual critics. In the majority of cases, however, a careful comparison of all the manuscripts will enable the textual critic to detect such cases of intentional error with reasonable certainty. Generally speaking, they fall into five distinct categories, in each of which the copyist has consciously sought to correct the text -- 1) marginal notes, or scholia, being transferred into the text itself, the scribe being uncertain as to whether such a note may not have been intended as a correction by a former scribe; 2) grammatical corrections, in which the copyist seeks to correct what he believes to be an ungrammatical, or wrong, form or spelling; 3) harmonistic alterations - especially common in the gospels, where a variant reading in one gospel is assimilated to that of the others in an attempt to "harmonize" the two and eliminate all differences; 4) traditional phraseology being inserted - especially common in reference to Christ, as, e.g., where a simple reading $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ would be expanded to the more traditional $\text{\textit{Ἰησοῦς Χριστός}}$ or $\text{\textit{ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός}}$ and 5) dogmatic alterations, where the copyist has consciously altered the text to bring it into agreement with his particular dogmatic position (cf. Matthew 1: 16).

When the critic has thus come to the point where he has collated, corrected, and studied each of the various manuscripts carefully, and has in so doing detected and eliminated all the identifiable errors due to transmission, intentional and unintentional, he finds, unfortunately, that all of the manuscripts still do not agree by any means - that is, that there are still a great number of variant readings in which the differences still cannot be accounted for under the above principles. He must recognize, of course, that in any number of variants, only one can be the correct reading of the original text; and that all of the others must be due to some sort of errors, not yet proven or recognized. On the other hand, he must recognize that in any given number of variants any one of them may be the correct reading of the original text, which means that he must now apply some further principles and tests in an attempt to discover which reading is to be accepted. There is, of course, still a third possibility - namely that none of the variant readings extant have reproduced the true text of the original, all of them having been corrupted somehow and the true text lost altogether, perhaps because the best manuscripts have disappeared altogether. In such cases, of course, there is little that can be done; and the critic must finally resort to what is called "conjectural emendation," or a qualified guess, as to what the original text contained. For the moment, however, let us lay aside this third possibility and return to the first two, assuming that the original text is actually contained in one or another of the different variants that remain; for the science of textual criticism has developed a number of additional principles and methods which have proven most effective in resolving all but a very small handful of problems arising from what we have termed variant readings.

(to be continued)

* * * * *

BOOK REVIEWS

Anderson, Gerald H., ed., The Theology of the Christian Mission, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961, 341 pages, price \$6.50.

At New Delhi in November, 1961, the International Missionary Council (IMC) was integrated with the WCC, where it became the New Division of the World Mission and Evangelism, with Bishop Lesslie Newbigin of the Church of South India, who had been full-time secretary of the IMC, now becoming the director of this New Division. Since that absorption of the IMC by the WCC, many have naturally been speculating as to what effect this would have on world-wide mission work. It has been pointed out that amalgamation does not necessarily increase mission work but perhaps more frequently retards it. Two classic examples are often given. The United Church of Canada (Methodist, Presbyterian and Congregational) merger, consummated in 1925, had 452 missionaries in 1936. But this number had declined to 245 by 1960. The Congregational and Christian churches merged in 1931. In 1936 they had 495 missionaries, a figure which had shrunk to 364 by 1960. Other examples confirm the observation that the recent amalgamation of IMC and WCC is considerably less than promising in stepping up the preaching of the Gospel of salvation through faith in Jesus Christ to those who sit in the darkness of unbelief.

One need not look far for the reason for this decline in missionary spirit. The ecumenical leaders, in greater or lesser degree, simply do not believe that Christianity is the only revealed religion of the only true God; that "neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." (Acts 4, 12)

A study of The Theology of the Christian Mission will quickly reveal that. This important book, a compendium of essays on various aspects of mission, was written by twenty-seven contributors, including such well-known theological names as: Karl Barth, Ernst Benz, A. C. Bouquet, Oscar Gullmann, Hendrik Kraemer, Lesslie Newbigin, Harold DeWolf, Floyd H. Ross, Paul Tillich, G. Ernest Wright, etc.

The book is an attempt on the part of Neo-orthodoxy to break away from the sheltered academic cloisters where it was spawned and get into the market place where its impact can be felt in a much wider circle.

The book is divided into four parts: Part I, The Biblical Basis, with six contributors; Part II, Historical Studies, with three contributors; Part III, Christianity and Other Faiths, with eight contributors; Part IV, Theory of Missions, with eight contributors.

While several of the chapters have some good things to say, which are acceptable when viewed in the light of the sacred Scripture, there is only one chapter (by Prof. Harold Lindsell of Fuller Theological Seminary) which sets forth an excellent statement on the uniqueness of Christianity. It states: "The foundation of all conservative missionary work is the concept of the Bible as the infallible word of God. By this it is construed that the Bible, in the Autographa, is without error of any kind, whether historical, geological, theological, etc. The view disavows mechanical dictation, and allows for differences in individual styles of writing." (p. 239). Later on, Prof. Lindsell states "all other religions, save Christianity, are inadequate and cannot provide salvation." (p. 246).

But this is a voice crying in the wilderness. An examination of Part III (Christianity and Other Faiths) reveals that Prof. Harold DeWolf has no doubt

summed up the view of most of the scholars who contributed to the compendium when he says: "Few Old Testament scholars would defend the doctrine that no other religions contributed to the religion of the ancient Hebrews. More specifically, various scholars believe that they can find evidences in the ancient Old Testament religion of contributions from the Egyptians, Midianites, Canaanites, and Babylonians" (p. 201). From this it is evident that DeWolf believes in some kind of evolutionary development of religion, and seems to think that this is the point of view that should be accepted by those who desire to go out and preach the Gospel, for he suggests that "few missionaries today, excepting some from the extreme Fundamentalist sects, would subscribe to so simple and extreme a view" (that is, the proposal of most of the earlier Protestant missionaries, who "regard the non-Christian religions as simply false and wholly evil"), (pp. 206-207).

Floyd H. Ross is even more specific in his denial of the uniqueness of Biblical Christianity. First he warns us against "trying to peg down truth too decisively" (p. 219). But he admits that the early Christians did put forth the claim that "there is no other name given under heaven for the salvation of men"; but he suggests that they were somewhat mistaken when he adds this comment: "That the early Christians may have been over-zealous in stating it in this way is a possibility the Christian must live with" (p. 219).

Dr. Ross has completely taken over Bultmann's idea that the theologian's purpose is to discover "the deeper meanings behind the New Testament mythological conceptions" (p. 224). In fact, he becomes so carried away with this approach that he gives utterance to statements such as this: "Where the mythic has been denied or repressed, Christians have taken refuge in sterile literalisms, legalisms, fundamentalisms, and brittle dogmatisms" (p. 226). And he reaches some kind of climax when he unequivocally asserts that "these confessions of faith (i.e., John 3, 16, and II Corinthians 5, 19, which he had just quoted), evoked by a man who had a place in history and who had an incomparable faith in God, were drawn from the same deep recesses of the human spirit as the ancient Chinese symbolism of Yin-Yang, Shiva-Shakti symbolism of Hinduism, and the Yah-Yum symbolism of Tibet" (p. 227).

Paul Tillich in his chapter, "Missions and World History," develops further the theology and purpose of missions which is propounded by these ecumenical leaders. He defines missions by first telling us what it is not and then what it is (pp. 283-289). It is not, according to Tillich, the nineteenth century liberal theology "that missions is a cross-fertilization of culture"; it is furthermore not "an attempt to unite the different religions"; and, certainly, "one should not misunderstand missions as an attempt to save from eternal damnation as many individuals as possible among the nations of the world." Tillich believes that missions "is the attempt to transform the latent Church -- which is present in the world religions, in paganism, Judaism, and humanism -- into something new: the New Reality in Jesus as the Christ."

One need hardly point out how flatly this contradicts the inspired words of Paul: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him" (I Corinthians 2, 9). But a book such as this ought to drive us to pray more fervently the mission prayer of Luther (who, incidentally, is accused of an "amazing lack of theology of missions" (p. 97)):

May God bestow on us His grace,
With blessings rich provide us,
And may the brightness of His face
To life eternal guide us

That we His saving health may know,
His gracious will and pleasure,
And also to the heathen show
Christ's riches without measure
And unto God convert them.

-- B. W. Teigen

* * * * *

Concerning Church Fellowship, A Statement of Principle, Revised Edition, 1961.
(Available from the Church of the Lutheran Confessions Book House, New Ulm,
Minn. Price, fifty cents. 43 pages.)

This booklet must be considered by all those who would attempt to discuss and evaluate the confessional position of this new church body in America - the Church of the Lutheran Confessions (CLC), organized several years ago by men who formerly held membership in the Wisconsin and Norwegian (ELS) synods.

The CLC asserts that there is a doctrinal difference between them and the Wisconsin Synod. In commenting on the Wisconsin Synod's action in suspending fellowship relations with the Missouri Synod, they say in their official church paper: "Is it not true that we withdrew from the Wisconsin Synod for that purpose, that the Wisconsin Synod would not only repent of its disobedience to the Word of God in its failure to separate from Missouri, but also of the false doctrine that was developed to defend and justify it? We find no hint of a change of doctrine in the resolutions." (The Lutheran Spokesman, September, 1961, p. 7.) Hence we believe it is fair to state that the justification for the organization and continued existence of the CLC must be sought in the doctrine of Church Fellowship. Furthermore, if there is one Bible passage which merits special consideration in the controversy, it is Romans 16: 17, since the CLC has more or less built its case on this passage. This is not to deny that the CLC has made other charges against Wisconsin, and hence also indirectly against the ELS, e.g., regarding the call; but the basic charge has been in the area of fellowship.

The CLC position in the most controverted point of all, that of separation from those with whom one has been in fellowship, is, briefly stated, this that as soon as we spot a person or church body "causing divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned", we are not only to "mark", but also to "avoid" them. The marking and the avoiding are to be simultaneous. We believe that the following quotations from the CLC pamphlet under review will verify this:

"We further believe, teach and confess that established fellowships or existing fellowships are to be terminated when it has been ascertained that a person or group through a false position is causing divisions and offenses in the Church." Page 22, Par. 46.

"Then there is also the weakness of language. A person may not express himself as he intended the meaning, or others may read something into his words which is not there. We do therefore teach that any Christian ought to be very sure before he will raise the cry of false teacher. He will make careful inquiry and ascertain exactly what is being taught by the suspected speaker. This may require little or much time. In the case of a person or group with whom one has been in fellowship it will by its nature involve an admonition or several admonitions. But we emphatically teach that the admonishing per se and by itself is not an absolute must, a condition sine

qua non, for the application of 'avoid them'." Page 30, Par. 65.

"All who deviate are to be avoided. They are to be avoided when it is clear that they are causing divisions and offenses in the Church." Page 34, Par. 74.

"We further believe and teach that suspension of an established fellowship is to take place when it has been ascertained that a person or group is causing divisions and offenses through a false position in doctrine or practice." Page 41, No. 7.

"Though the teaching Church is ever an admonishing Church, we reject the opinion that separation from errorists is dependent upon the course of admonition." Page 42, l,e.

The ELS position of long standing has been this, very briefly, that when a person or church body with whom we are in fellowship causes divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which we have learned, we mark them immediately, then admonish, and if this proves fruitless, avoid them. To verify this, we quote from a synodical essay of 1936, later printed in pamphlet form and given wide distribution among the clergy of the Synodical Conference, entitled: "Unity, Union, and Unionism". The words quoted below from this essay are those of Prof. Laetsch of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, (CTM, Vol. VI, p. 8), but the ELS committee presenting the essay states that it subscribes to and endorses them. The following quotations will be found in the 1936 Norwegian Synod Report, pages 49-50, or in the pamphlet "Unity, Union and Unionism", pages 29-30.

"Mark them, observe them, plead with them, patiently show them the error of their way. If they hear you, you have not only gained them, you have also removed the offense and restored the peace, and thus kept the unity of the Spirit intact. But if they continue making divisions, if they persist in teaching their error or remain in membership with a body that teaches such error and thus help to create and maintain the divisions and offenses caused by errorists, then the clear and plain injunction of the apostle is 'Avoid them', sever fraternal connection with them."

"The point of the apostle's admonition is to avoid those, all those, who cause those divisions. Neither should we wait until they have actually deceived, misled, people, until they have by their actions betrayed their true character; but as soon as they teach contrary to the doctrine laid down in the Bible, they are to be marked, admonished, and, if they continue, avoided."

The above quoted position of the ELS regarding Romans 16: 17, does not militate against or contradict those other clear passages which speak of how to deal with an erring brother, e.g., Titus 3: 10, 2 Timothy 2: 24-26, 2 Timothy 4: 2, Galatians 6: 1, etc., but rather permits the carrying out of all passages, also Romans 16: 17, where necessary. This interpretation follows the Lutheran principle of letting Scripture interpret Scripture. We fail to understand how the CLC in the light of their position as outlined in the booklet under review could carry out the Scriptural obligations toward an erring brother as presented in the above passages.

The booklet indicates that the admonition which Scripture enjoins one to give an erring brother might be given before one marks him as causing divisions and offenses. The following quotations would seem to indicate this possibility: "When errorists by their adherence to their errors 'cause divisions and offences' in the Church, we are told . . ." (Page 28, Par. 61). "As we have seen, there

may be years of admonition before a person is revealed as causing divisions and offenses by his errors, or it could become clear at one meeting that the basis for fellowship has been removed by adherence to error." (Page 30, Par. 65). We shall have something to say about that "one meeting" matter later, but apart from that, we could accept this answer as satisfactory if one could say that a person or group espousing false doctrine does not become guilty of causing divisions and offenses until he does so knowingly, willingly, or persistently. However, it is not adherence to error which reveals one as causing divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine, but rather the error itself which is presented or introduced. If it is pure doctrine which makes unity, then it is false doctrine which causes divisions and offenses. Now it is true that the passage speaks of "them" which cause divisions and offenses, but they become guilty by virtue of the false doctrine which they espouse rather than by the fact that they adhere to it. The adherence to error deepens and widens the offense, to be sure, but the error itself causes the divisions and offenses. This position alone gives "the Marks of the Church" their due regard and place.

There are some statements in the booklet which are quite disturbing. For example, "Though the teaching Church is ever an admonishing Church, we reject the opinion the separation from errorists is dependent upon the course of admonition." (Page 42, l.e.) This is not the voice of the Good Shepherd speaking. Furthermore, we have a hard time reconciling it with a statement of February 9, 1959, "A Call for Decision", signed by those who are now among the leaders of the CLC -- H. C. Duehlmeier, Martin Galstad, Roland Gurgel, Paul Nolting, Rollin A. Reim, Egbert Schaller -- in which they state: "For the purpose of clarifying our objections, we submit the following as a true and correct statement of the doctrinal issue involved: Termination of church fellowship is called for when Scriptural correction has been offered and rejected and the erring brother or church body have continued in their error despite admonition. This is the persistence which distinguishes an errorist (Romans 16: 17-18) from an erring brother (Galatians 2: 11-14)."

Another strange statement is this: ". . . or it could become clear at one meeting that the basis for fellowship has been removed by adherence to error." (Page 30, Par. 65). One meeting? What kind of spirit is this which makes such an assertion? We suggest that this would come awfully close to demanding the clairvoyance which the signers of a Call for Decision so unjustly accused the leaders of Wisconsin of needing to carry out their position.

The booklet attempts to define the state of the controversy, a formidable task indeed. We are puzzled at times as to which church body or bodies are meant. For example: "Finally, among those who maintain that all manifestations of fellowship with errorists are forbidden, a dispute has arisen concerning the application of the term heterodox church to communions which had previously adhered to the true teachings of Scripture, but later departed from them. Some have taught that at least a limited fellowship is to be practiced as long as such erring groups do not blaspheme the Word of God and do not refuse to discuss the issues. Others teach that fellowship with such groups is forbidden when it becomes apparent after careful consideration that the error is actually being taught and defended." (Page 5, Par. 2). Another example: "Some have taught that the exercise of church fellowship is to cease when it is clear that the error is actually being taught and defended; others have taught that fellowship may be practiced as long as the errorists do not blaspheme the Word of God and do not refuse to discuss the issues involved." (Page 40, Par. 3.)

There is much in the booklet with which we agree, and this should not be surprising considering the fact that we shared a common bond of fellowship for many years. Our failure to quote such points of agreement is due only to the fact

that, following Lutheran tradition, we want to get to the points of controversy and seek to clear them up.

In a general way, the CLC position on Church Fellowship, as expressed in this booklet, leads one to ask: What course of action will prevail in the CLC in the many instances requiring admonition and discipline which are bound to crop up in any church body? When a brother, a congregation, or congregations, fall into error, will there be a fervent, evangelical desire and effort to win them back — like unto that which our Savior must show and does show to each of us if ever we are to reach our heavenly home — or will there be an immediate determination of whether or not they are persistent in their error, and if so, avoidance, without any real effort being made to win them back to the truth? The booklet is not reassuring to us on this point. We believe the position of the CLC on Church Fellowship exposes them to a very real danger of legalism. It will be enlightening to watch especially those who have their theological training under this position; and one shudders as he thinks of the saying that a pupil often goes one step farther than his teacher.

-- Theodore Aaberg

* * * * *

VINEYARDS IN EGYPT

Herodotus is a Greek historian who lived about 484-425 B. C. Plutarch is a Greek writer who lived about 46-120 A. D. Both of these writers indicate that there were no vineyards in Egypt and that wine was not used in Egypt.

The Bible, however, contains the story of Joseph in Egypt, with the item about the butler of Pharaoh saying:

"In my dream, behold, a vine was before me; and in the vine were three branches; and it was as though it budded, and her blossoms shot forth; and the clusters thereof brought forth ripe grapes; and Pharaoh's cup was in my hand; and I took the grapes, and pressed them into Pharaoh's cup, and I gave the cup into Pharaoh's hand." - Gen. 40: 9-11.

Now, when it became fashionable to be "ultra-intellectual," and "scientific," the difference between the Greek writers and the Bible was "solved" in this way that such men claimed there was a mistake in the Bible in regard to vineyards and wine.

It should have been simple enough to point out that these Greek writers were doing their writing a thousand or more years after Moses wrote Genesis, and that therefore they could be writing about something that was true at a different time in the history of Egypt. Besides, these Greek writers, they could have pointed out, might be the ones that made the mistake rather than the Bible.

How foolish the unbelievers were came to light when excavations in Egypt began to show portrayal of grapes being picked and being trod in a winepress to press out the juice. And this pictorial art dates back to a time before Joseph came to Egypt.

Yes, the very stones cry out against unbelievers.

Ex.

* * * * *