



Lutheran Synod Quarterly

INSTALLATION SERMON
Rev. Theodore Aaberg

THE MEANING AND USE OF THE GREEK NEW
TESTAMENT CRITICAL APPARATUS (Cont.)
Prof. Julian Anderson

WHAT IS THE BIBLE?
Prof. Glenn Reichwald

WHERE DO THEY NOW STAND?
Prof. Glenn Reichwald

THE CLEVELAND CONVENTION
Rev. T. N. Teigen

BOOK REVIEWS

FT. WAYNE, 1857--CLEVELAND, 1962
Rev. T. N. Teigen

LUTHERAN SYNOD QUARTERLY

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

Edited by the Theological Faculty of the ELS Theological Seminary

M. H. Otto, Managing Editor, % Bethany Lutheran College, Mankato, Minn.

Volume III, No. I (Published Quarterly) September, 1962

Subscription Price: \$2.00 per year Single Copy, 50¢

INSTALLATION SERMON

For Prof. Julian Anderson, Bethany Lutheran Seminary Mankato, Minnesota, September 18, 1962

"And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." II Timothy 2:2.

Dear Friends in Christ:

This is an important day for many people. It is important for our new professor and his family. After years of service in parishes in Minneapolis and Chicago, he will now devote his time and talents almost exclusively to the teaching and training of pastors in our seminary and college.

The day is important also for our seminary student body which receives three new members. It surely must be with a sense of awe that these men take up their theological studies, looking toward the day when they may serve as pastors under that chief Shepherd of the flock, Jesus Christ. We hope that many of the boys in the high school and college departments of our school will follow in their footsteps in the years to come.

But this day holds the greatest importance for a large group of people who are not present, many of whom are not yet born, and they are the people of the congregations which make up our Synod, as well as many people outside our fellowship who in years to come will have some contact with the graduates of this seminary. In other words, this day is most important to all those people in various parts of the world who in the future will be served spiritual food, formally and informally, by the graduates of this seminary.

Why is this day so important to them? Because a seminary is no better than its teachers. The recipe for the spiritual fare which pastors set before the people in the congregations has, to a great extent, been put together at the seminary. The seminary is, in a sense, the fountain of our church, and only if its streams, its doctrine, is kept pure, will the waters as they flow hither and yon throughout the world be pure. If the fountain is muddy, what will the streams be? Hence the importance of this

day when a new professor is to be installed, and when new students cross the seminary's threshold.

Some may say: But your seminary is so small that it really makes little difference how you do your work as teacher and student. The devil and the Old Adam are not above coming with such ideas also, especially when one is tired and discouraged. Well, is one soul insignificant? Do not the angels, that host which cannot be numbered, fill heaven with rejoicing when one sinner repents? How then can the training of even one pastor who shall labor for the salvation of souls be unimportant or insignificant?

May the Holy Spirit bless our consideration of Paul's word to Timothy where he instructs regarding: THE TASK OF A SEMINARY PROFESSOR.

I. The Scope of a Seminary Professor's Task.

The scope of a seminary professor's work, whether that be in the more informal manner carried out by Timothy as he also tended to his many pastoral duties, or in the more formal manner of our day where a school and faculty are set up for this specific purpose, is defined in our text: "And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men. . ."

What were the things Timothy had heard from Paul? They were the things that God had revealed to Paul, beginning with the revelation outside the gates of Damascus. These things Paul had given to Timothy, even as to the Corinthians, to whom he writes: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures." (I Cor. 15:3-4)

When Paul tells Timothy that he had heard these things from him "among many witnesses", he is referring to the fact that his teaching was not different than that of the prophets of the Old Testament. All you have to do to learn this is to note in the writings of Paul how often he calls upon the scriptures, that is, the Old Testament, to corroborate what he is teaching.

The scope of a seminary professor's work then, whether that be in Timothy's day or in 1962, is to teach the apostolic-prophetic Word to the students, to instruct in the Law and in the Gospel as they appear in the Holy Scriptures, God's revelation to man.

You are not called to be a theological explorer who wanders far and wide not only through Scripture but beyond Scripture, through the vast regions of human philosophical speculation and assertion, coming up with a system of theology which in truth must be prefaced with the words: "Thus saith Professor So and So." Rather, you are called to labor in that vast and beautiful field that is bordered and hedged in on every side with sacred Scripture so that in every doctrine which you hold before your students you may say in very truth: "Thus saith the Lord."

Some may regard this as being terribly narrow-minded, as well as stifling, if indeed not suffocating, to an intelligent man. But such people are spiritually ignorant. They do not know that God's Word is a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our way, and that through the Word the Holy Spirit leads regenerate man who of himself is spiritually blind, into the realm of truth and shows him the many treasures and riches of God's grace to sinful man. It is those who seek their theology in whole or in part in their human reason rather than in the Word alone who are the birds in a cage. The Christian theologian rejoices in being bound to the Word, as he prays:

O may these heavenly pages be
My ever dear delight;
And still new beauties may I see,
And still increasing light.

Divine Instructor, gracious Lord!
Be Thou forever near;
Teach me to love Thy sacred word,
And view my Savior there!

Hymnary 135, 5-6

To our new professor, as well as to all who teach in our seminary, we say: To this you are bound: "And the things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men..." We expect, yes, we demand of you, that all your teaching be in accord with the apostolic-prophetic Word. May God give you the grace to carry this out every time you step before your students.

As an encouragement to faithfulness in your difficult task, consider:

II. The Purpose of a Seminary Professor's Task.

Paul says in our text: "...the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also."

The primary meaning of these words is no doubt this that Timothy should be reminded that these students of his must have a certain ability to teach God's Word to others. They are to be "apt to teach", as he writes in his first letter to Timothy concerning pastors.

But these words also serve to remind us of the goal of all seminary teaching. There is to be a faithful, thorough indoctrination and training of the students so that they may go out into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, and through such preaching "...bind up the broken-hearted, ...proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." (Is. 61:1)

This is what makes the task of teaching in the seminary a glorious work, for when it is rightly done it is not an ivory tower matter, a getting away from the world, but in a very real sense, a going out into all the world, for it is through their training in the Word in the seminary, training blessed by the Holy Spirit, that these young men go out into the world as "able ministers of the new testament." (II Cor. 3:6).

As you carry out your work of teaching students the Word of God from day to day in the quiet of the seminary classroom, may you ever hold before your eyes the purpose of it all: "Who shall be able to teach others also" and thus find encouragement for your labors.

So let our new professor take up his work with zeal, let all others who teach in our seminary be renewed in zeal, let our students be faithful, trustworthy, dependable, so that in years to come our graduates may be a blessing to the world as they proclaim the Gospel, that many souls, reconciled to God by the death of Christ, may through faith in Christ find entrance into eternal life.

Amen.

-- Theodore Aaberg
Scarville, Iowa

THE MEANING AND USE OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT CRITICAL APPARATUS
(continued)

By the Rev. Julian Anderson

One of the most important steps still to be taken is the careful evaluation of each of the manuscripts as to its age and general reliability and value. It is clear, of course, that at this point the textual critic, from his previous collation and study of the different manuscripts, will have already formed some opinion as to the general reliability of each one. That is to say, he will know by now how carefully each manuscript was copied, and the particular types of errors which are most prevalent in each one. Here, it should be noted, there are great differences in our various manuscripts, some of them showing signs of very careful and painstaking efforts, while others are obviously very carelessly done, as in the case of some which seem to have been very hastily copied by some untrained copyist to serve simply as private copies for some individual. Some of our oldest and best manuscripts, as, for example, B and Aleph, show unmistakable signs of having been very carefully copied, and then corrected by as many as four different correctors, indicating, no doubt, that they were made to serve as some sort of "official" texts in some larger church. This much, at any rate--the general reliability of each manuscript--will already have been pretty much determined by the previous study, and will be duly noted now.

The next step--and a most important one also--will be the attempt to fix the approximate age of each of the manuscripts, following the principle that, by and large, the oldest manuscripts will be the best, insofar as they are closer to the text of the original autographs in point of time, and have, presumably, then been subject to less corruption in the form of errors of transmission. This rule cannot, of course, be applied invariably, or treated as a rule without exceptions, since it is possible that a late manuscript may have been copied directly from a much older and more exact exemplar than another manuscript which is admittedly much older, but which has been copied, in turn, from an exemplar which is either later or more carelessly done. In actual practice, however, there seem to be very few of such exceptions, so that the relative age of our manuscripts is a highly important factor to be considered.

In seeking to so determine the age of any manuscript the textual critic is greatly indebted to the science of paleography, that branch of study which concerns itself with the study of ancient documents--a discipline which demands, however, the greatest training and skill. Suffice it to say that this science of paleography has firmly established the fact that any ancient document may be dated with reasonable precision by taking into account two factors-- 1) the type of writing employed; and 2) the material on which this writing appears.

To summarize briefly, the paleographers have demonstrated that the materials used may be very helpful in determining the age of a manuscript, especially in singling out the oldest manuscripts. Using this criterion all extant manuscripts are divided into three classes--those written on 1) papyrus, 2) vellum, and 3) paper. Since the use of these three substances as writing materials in the ancient world can be fairly accurately dated, this forms a useful classification.

Papyrus, for example, made from the papyrus plant, which grew in profusion in the Nile valley, is known to be the earliest writing material, aside from stone, used in the Mediterranean world. Its use has been established well back into the pre-Christian era; and during the first three centuries of the Christian church it was practically the only material used for literary purposes. The usual form of an

ancient papyrus "book" was the roll, made by gluing together a number of separate sheets. Practical considerations, however, imposed a certain limit on the size of such rolls, since any roll beyond 30 or 35 feet in length became too bulky and unmanageable to handle. It should be added, however, that for the books of the New Testament, which were written and circulated originally as individual books, such an arrangement was ideal, since the longest of the New Testament books--the Gospel of Luke--could be accommodated nicely on a roll of about 32 or 33 feet in length. This, incidentally, may have been a factor in determining the ultimate length of the four gospels at the time of composition by the individual authors.

In time, however, due to various economic conditions, the use of papyrus declined, and by about the year 300 A.D. it had been almost completely replaced, as a medium for the production of literary works, by vellum. Beyond this point papyrus was used only for non-literary purposes. The significance of all this is that it supplies the textual critic with a convenient and accurate terminus ad quem, since any manuscript of the New Testament written on papyrus must almost certainly be dated prior to 300 or 350 A.D. In recent years, with the exciting new papyrus discoveries in the rubbish-heaps of Egypt, the number of such papyrus manuscripts of the New Testament has grown immensely, adding much valuable material, because of its great age, to the stockpile of the textual critic. Papyrus manuscripts,--all of them, unfortunately, quite fragmentary in character,--are designated in the textual apparatus by an old English lower case p, with a number immediately added in a superscript position (see pages 30-32 of Nestle's sixteenth edition). These, then, represent the oldest of all extant manuscripts, and a very important class for the textual critic. The two severe limitations to the usefulness of these papyrus manuscripts are the fact that they are so few in number, relatively speaking; and that they are all mere fragments, some containing no more than a few verses of one book.

The principal papyrus fragments are listed in Nestle's tables on pages 30-32--1, 22, 37, and 45 for the gospels, all of them third century; 38 and 48 for Acts, also of the third century, together with 8 and 23 of the fourth century; 32 and 46 for the Pauline epistles and Hebrews, of the third century, and 10, 13, and 15 of the fourth century; and 47, a third century manuscript containing nine chapters of Revelation. Numbers 45, 46, and 47 make up the famous Chester Beatty collection, discovered in 1931. The earliest known papyrus fragment--not listed in Nestle's tables--is the famous Rylands Papyrus--number 52--containing a few verses of John's gospel, dated between 100 and 150 A.D. The most recently discovered and published papyrus manuscript--called papyrus Bodmer II--has been classified as p⁶⁶, and dated about 200 A.D., making it one of our oldest manuscripts. It contains considerable portions of John's Gospel, and is thus an important addition to the ever-growing list of papyri. The fact that there are still so many papyrus fragments which are as yet unpublished leads one to hope that there may be some important finds regarding the text of the New Testament still to be revealed.

According to our present state of knowledge, it was some time in the first part of the fourth century (300-350 A.D.) that the important change took place from papyrus to vellum as the common type of writing material for ancient books around the Mediterranean. This new material, made from the skins of animals, possessed two distinct advantages over the older papyrus. In the first place, it was much more durable, and when one considers the immense amount of labor involved in producing or copying an ancient book, this was a factor of no mean importance. Secondly, vellum was much more suitable for binding into the new "codex" form, in which separate sheets were bound together in exactly the same form as our modern books, making the book much more easy to handle and immeasurably increasing the ease with which a particular passage might be located, as, for example, with a cross-reference. So far as the early church was concerned, both of these factors were of great importance, for it was just about this time--around 300 or so--that the New Testament canon had

crystallized--the conception of a single authoritative "New Testament" in the modern sense, made up of all of the twenty seven books which had been circulated previously on an individual basis. At this point, then, it became both desirable and necessary to have all of the books of the New Testament inscribed in a single copy--something which was manifestly impossible with the old papyrus rolls. The best that could be done under the old system was to have the New Testament made up on four rolls: one containing the four gospels; another, Acts and the Catholic epistles; another, the Pauline epistles; and the fourth, Revelation.

It was just at this time also (313 A.D.) that the church emerged as the official religion of the Roman Empire--a factor which necessitated the production of a number of "official" copies of the New Testament scriptures for the various churches of the Empire. The ultimate result of all this, then, was that the church discarded completely the use of papyrus and adopted vellum as the writing material for all its copies of the New Testament. For the next four and a half centuries, in fact--from 300 to 750--vellum was the sole kind of writing material in use in the Christian world--a factor of considerable importance in the dating of manuscripts.

Somewhere in the eighth century--perhaps about 750 or so--a new type of writing material was introduced in the Mediterranean world--paper, imported at first from China. While at first it was regarded as a novelty, in the course of time paper established its superiority over vellum and ultimately replaced it completely, although not until many centuries had passed during which both were used. It was soon discovered that the new paper was almost as durable as vellum, and that it could be produced much more cheaply. Furthermore, it was so light in weight that by using paper, an ancient book, such as a Bible, could be reduced to a much more convenient size. It is thus evident that no paper manuscript, of which there are a number, can be dated earlier than 750 A.D.; while vellum manuscripts may be dated by this criterion alone all the way from 300 to 1450 A.D.

The second criterion developed by the science of paleography to determine the relative age of any manuscript is the type, or style, of writing employed therein. In this respect all manuscripts may be divided into two classifications-- 1) those written in uncials, or capital letters; and 2) those written in cursive style, using lower case, or minuscule letters.

In this respect it has been established beyond doubt that the uncial style of writing is the oldest, dating back many centuries before the Christian era. In the case of literary works of any sort it was, in fact, the only form of writing employed until some time in the ninth century (about 850 or so) --a factor of considerable importance to the textual critic, since again it supplies a convenient terminus ad quem--namely, that any uncial manuscript must almost certainly be dated prior to 850 A.D. The fact that the uncial period coincides with remarkable exactness to the vellum period means that all of our uncial manuscripts are written on either papyrus or vellum--a fact which puts them in a separate category, as our oldest, and generally, best manuscripts, in our attempt to recover the original text of the New Testament.

The uncial style of writing makes use of all capital letters--"inch-long," as Jerome described them--each letter being written separately, and with no spaces between words or sentences, and generally few, if any, marks of punctuation. In the present critical apparatus such uncial manuscripts are indicated by the use of capital letters of the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew alphabets (cf. pages 30-32 in Nestle's sixteenth edition). There are only about 200 of these uncials, of which only a dozen or so are regarded as of any major importance, as will be seen later.

Of these uncials it is generally agreed that eight are of surpassing importance

in the area of textual criticism; and any person who desires to use the critical apparatus intelligently must familiarize himself thoroughly with these eight. The first is the famed Codex Sinaiticus, designated by the Hebrew letter Aleph, now the property of the British Museum. This magnificent vellum codex was once a complete Bible, containing both Old and New Testaments. In its present state, parts of the Old Testament have been lost, but fortunately all of the New Testament text remains in a complete form, plus the apocryphal books of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas. Aleph was discovered under the most romantic circumstances quite by accident by the famed textual critic, G. F. C. von Tischendorf, in a monastery near Mount Sinai in 1844. Stated more exactly, a few sheets of this codex were discovered by Tischendorf at this time--in a waste-basket, being used by the monks to kindle their fires! Asking permission to take a few sheets home with him, Tischendorf at once recognized it as a very ancient Greek manuscript of the Old Testament, and made several more trips to the monastery in an attempt to recover the rest of the book. His search was not rewarded until 1859, when all the rest of the Old Testament and the whole text of the New Testament was discovered. This treasure was first presented as a gift to the Czar of Russia, from whom it was purchased by the British Museum for 100,000 pounds. It is generally accepted now by all critics as being a manuscript of the fourth century, making it the second oldest of all our important uncials. Its place of origin is almost certainly the great city of Alexandria, in Egypt.

The Codex Sinaiticus is exceeded in age, importance, and value only by the beautiful Codex Vaticanus, designated as B in the critical apparatus, also a vellum codex. The property of the Roman church, having been kept in the Vatican since 1481, B is universally accepted by all critics as being the oldest and best of all of our extant manuscripts. Like Aleph, it, too, originally contained the text of the entire Bible, Old and New Testaments. In its present state, however, the New Testament text ends at Hebrews 9:14, a number of the final pages having been lost. This manuscript has been confidently dated as having been copied around the middle of the fourth century, also in Alexandria, and is very closely related with Aleph, as we shall see.

The third of the great uncials in order of importance is generally regarded to be the vellum Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus, designated in the critical apparatus as C. It derives its name from the fact that at a very early date (perhaps 7th or 8th century) the entire Greek text of the New Testament was rubbed out, or erased, so that the codex could be used over again--this time to transcribe some of the sermons of an early Syrian father, Ephraem. Thus the Latin term "rescriptus," meaning "written over again," being a translation of the Greek word palimpsest. Fortunately, the original Greek text is still discernable and legible in all but a few places, although often with great difficulty. In more recent years modern scientific methods have been of great benefit in this respect. Like Aleph and B, C is also a manuscript containing the entire text of the New Testament; and, being dated in the fifth century, it is a most important witness.

Next in the list is the Codex Bezae, designated by the letter D in the critical apparatus. Originally the property of the famous Swiss reformer, Theodore Beza, it was donated by him to the library of Cambridge in 1581. An interesting feature of this codex is the fact that it is bi-lingual, with a Greek text on the left side and a corresponding Latin text on the right. This Latin text is designated among the other Latin versions by the small letter d. Unfortunately, this very old manuscript, which has now been dated by the best critics in the fifth century, contains only a portion of the New Testament--namely the four gospels, Acts, and III John. Another interesting feature is that it contains the four gospels in the so-called "western" order--Matthew, John, Luke and Mark. The most significant feature of D, however, is the fact that its text is so greatly different from the other three uncials already named, especially because of its many additions to the text; and the great importance of this

manuscript because of this fact will be discussed later. Most of the modern critics feel, in fact, that D is surpassed in importance only by Aleph and B. It is generally agreed that its place of origin was in Sicily, Sardinia, or southern France.

Next in the list of importance is one of the most recently discovered vellum codices, the Codex Freerianus, designated by the letter W in the critical apparatus, since it is preserved in Washington, D.C. It derives its name from its former owner, Mr. Freer, of Detroit, Michigan, who acquired possession of this valuable document upon its discovery in 1906. Since then it has been diligently studied and dated in the fifth century, making it one of the five oldest manuscripts extant. Like C, W is also fragmentary in nature, containing only the text of the gospels, and a few portions of the Pauline epistles. Also resembling D is the fact that it has the four gospels in the western order. The importance of W will also be commented on later.

Sixth in the order of importance is the most recently discovered of all the uncials, the Codex Koridethian, designated by the Greek letter Θ in the critical apparatus. Discovered in 1913, this manuscript has had far-reaching effects on the science of textual criticism, as will be discussed later. Although it is one of the later uncials in point of age--being of the eighth century--it is now generally agreed that it preserves a very early form of the text, and a most important type of text, showing great divergences from the three oldest manuscripts, somewhat in the same tradition as D, but not, certainly, identical thereto. Unfortunately, it contains only the text of the four gospels. This interesting find is proof of the fact that the value of a manuscript depends not entirely on its age, but on its pedigree and genealogy.

Next on the list is another manuscript not remarkable for its great age, but of great value nonetheless--the eighth century manuscript Codex Regius, designated as L in the critical apparatus. The chief importance of this manuscript, as will be noted later, is that it contains a good text of the gospels which agrees very closely with the three oldest manuscripts, Aleph, B, and C. Like Θ, it contains only the four gospels.

Last on the list of the eight great uncials is a manuscript which has had a very checkered history, the Codex Alexandrinus, designated as A in the critical apparatus. Its primary place on the list is due to the fact that it was "discovered" at a very early date, textually speaking--in the year 1628--when the science of textual criticism was still in its infancy. At that time it was rightly regarded as the earliest of all the known uncials, and therefore one of the primary authorities for the text of the New Testament. Since the great discoveries of Aleph and B in the nineteenth century (B was not published until 1868), and more particularly the twentieth century discoveries of W and Θ, however, the critical value of A has been drastically revised, and it now appears as eighth on the list, despite the fact that it is a manuscript of very great age, harking back to the fifth century. Its text, however, especially in the gospels, has been subject to a great deal of corruption. In the balance of the New Testament, however,--for A, like Aleph, B, and C, contains the entire New Testament--it is still one of our foremost and best witnesses.

Other uncials of considerable, though lesser, importance are Δ and Ε for the gospels, and D₂, F₂, and G₂ for the Pauline epistles. Of the other uncials no mention need be made here.

All of the other manuscripts--making up, in fact, the great bulk of our New Testament documents--are thus classified by their style of writing as minuscules, or cursives--so-called because of the distinctive cursive style of writing employed in their production. The cursive, or running, style, it should be observed, which employs lower case letters, with all of them being run together, as in our modern

system of writing, was developed as far back as the earliest period of the Christian era; but during these early centuries this style was used only for non-literary, or private, documents. It was not, in fact, until the middle of the eighth century (750 or thereabouts) that a literary cursive style came into general use in the Mediterranean world; and not until about a century later (about 850 or so) that this literary cursive style began to be employed by the church in the copying of its sacred books. From this point on, however, the textual critic must keep in mind that the literary cursive style almost completely replaced the older uncial style, mainly because of its greater convenience, both as to copying and reading, and as to the resultant size of the books so produced. This rather sharp and definite dividing line is of great usefulness in the science of textual criticism in determining the age of our documents, since all uncials may conveniently be dated before 850 A.D., while all minuscules, or cursives, must be dated sometime later than that date. Needless to say, the great bulk of our existing Greek manuscripts are of this later, minuscule, style--some 2,500 of them all told. From the standpoint of age they are, of course, of much less importance in the recovery of the original text of the New Testament than the older uncials, especially the oldest and best uncials. In our present critical apparatus the cursives are designated by arabic numerals-- 1, 5, 13, 28, etc.-- (cf. page 15 in Nestle's sixteenth edition).

One must not be misled, however, into believing that all of the minuscules are necessarily of lesser value than all of the uncials, simply because of their later age. Such a view disregards entirely the possibility that a cursive manuscript may have been copied from a very early and accurate uncial, now non-existent; and that if this be the case, and if it were copied carefully, such a cursive will preserve faithfully a very early form of text. Indeed, as B. H. Streeter points out in his classic work, "The Four Gospels," there are some of the minuscules which are of greater importance to the textual critic than any of the uncials other than the first eight. At this point, then, mention will be made briefly of some of these more valuable cursives.

Heading the list is the ninth century cursive manuscript 33, styled the "queen of the cursives," and preserving a text which very closely resembles that of Aleph, B, and C. Next might be mentioned 81, a manuscript copied in the year 1044, containing the text of the Acts, which no less an authority than Kenyon styles "the best of the minuscules, ranking with the leading uncials."² It, too, exhibits a text closely agreeing with Aleph, B, and C. So far as its text is concerned, the cursive manuscript 579, a thirteenth century manuscript, falls into the same category as 33 and 81, and is of considerable interest.

Number 28, an eleventh or twelfth century cursive, is of great importance to the text critic in that it preserves a very early form of the text of the gospels closely resembling the fifth century codex D, with a mixture of readings similar to Θ and W. Number 565 is one of the oldest of all cursives, bearing the rather romantic name, "The Empress Theodora's Codex"--a ninth century document, preserving a text which is very closely related to that of Θ. In this respect it is joined by the twelfth century cursive 700.

Aside from the above half dozen cursives which have been mentioned individually, it is usually customary to group the minuscules into families on the basis of their common descent as shown by their close resemblances to one another; and before leaving this subject mention must be made of two such family groups. The first is the so-called Family 1, consisting of cursives numbered 1, 118, 131, and 209. Sometimes this family is designated by the lower case Greek λ, since the first one to

²Kenyon, F., Our Bible and The Ancient Manuscripts, p. 153.

recognize this group of four as a distinct family was Kirsopp Lake. All four of these manuscripts are of the eleventh or twelfth century; and the family exhibits a text very closely similar to Θ and W. Since Lake's first discovery it has been noted that cursives 22, 872, 1278 and 1582 also bear a close family resemblance to this group. One interesting point, which may be noted in passing, is the fact that cursive l has played a very important part in the history of textual criticism, since it was this manuscript which was used by the great Dutch scholar, Erasmus, as the basis for his first printed Greek text of the New Testament in 1516.

The only other notable group of cursives which is of any real significance to the textual critic is the so-called Family 13, made up of four manuscripts--13, 69, 122, and 346--to which might be added numbers 230, 543, 788, 826, 828, 983, 1689, and 1709, as being somewhat more distantly related. This group, sometimes designated as the Ferrar group (ϕ), all show evidence of having originated in the neighborhood of Calabria from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries. Like Family 1, they show a text which often resembles the uncials Θ and W. Aside from these 26 cursives named above, all the others may be practically disregarded so far as being of any real value in the ultimate recovery of the original text of the New Testament.

In summary, then, we find that our extant Greek manuscripts--some 4,000 in number--are sub-divided and classified into three types in our critical apparatus, one class being characterized by the type of writing material used--the papyrus fragments (Old English p); and the other two being distinguished by the style of writing employed--the uncials (capital letters), and the minuscules (arabic numerals). And we have also seen that for all practical purposes, the textual critic may safely set aside a little over 99% of this total number and confine his attention to something less than three dozen documents--eight uncials and 26 cursives.

(to be continued)

* * * * *

WHAT IS THE BIBLE?

Dr. Horace Hummel of Wartburg Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa, offers his definition of the Bible in the March, 1962, issue of The Ambassador, publication of the Wartburg student body. According to him, the Bible is "not a manual of 'timeless' truths, doctrines, laws, and texts which speak automatically and directly to personal needs or contemporary situations, but rather a collection of highly variegated 'tracts for the times' speaking originally to needs and situations which often vary widely from those of today." (p. 1) These comments are contained in an article entitled "The Role of Archaeology in Biblical Studies".

Paul disagreed in Romans 15:4, where he told the Romans that the Old Testament had direct value. As for the use of texts, it is very Biblical for the Lutheran Church to make use of proof texts. Our Savior used them in meeting Satan, who, incidentally, made a false appeal to Scripture. In Galatians 3:16 Paul could even appeal to one word "seed". One cannot help wondering whether or not this is a left-handed criticism of the historic Biblical doctrine of verbal inspiration. One will readily grant that there are many useful helps for Bible study--Bible dictionaries, introductions, grammars of original languages, etc.--but they never can rise above the Scriptures and what is written there.

WHERE DO THEY NOW STAND?

The readers of The Lutheran Synod Quarterly should be interested in the doctrinal paragraphs of the two recently organized Lutheran church bodies, The American Lutheran Church (TALC) and the Lutheran Church in America (LCA). While both of these newly merged bodies must be considered against their historical background, one must also know where they stand today. The doctrinal paragraphs of these two new bodies were quoted in the September, 1961, issue of the Lutheran World, pages 203-204, the publication of the Lutheran World Federation.

The doctrinal paragraph of the TALC is as follows:

ARTICLE IV - Confession of Faith

Section 1. The American Lutheran Church accepts all of the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments as a whole and in all their parts as the divinely inspired, revealed, and inerrant Word of God, and submits to this as the only infallible authority in all matters of faith and life.

Section 2. As brief and true statements of the doctrines of the Word of God, the Church accepts and confesses the following Symbols, subscription to which shall be required of all its members, both congregations and individuals:

- (1) The ancient ecumenical Creeds: The Apostolic, the Nicene, and the Athanasian;
- (2) The unaltered Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism.

Section 3. As further elaboration of and in accord with these Lutheran Symbols, the Church also receives the other documents in the Book of Concord of 1580: the Apology, Luther's Large Catechism, the Smalcald Articles, and the Formula of Concord; and recognizes them as normative for its theology.

Section 4. The American Lutheran Church accepts without reservation the symbolical books of the evangelical Lutheran Church, not insofar as but because they are the presentation and explanation of the pure doctrine of the Word of God and a summary of the faith of the evangelical Lutheran Church.

ARTICLE XX - Amendments

Section 1. The doctrinal basis and confessional subscription of The American Lutheran Church, as contained in Article IV of the Constitution, shall be unalterable; and no amendment to this constitution shall conflict therewith.

The Doctrinal paragraph of the LCA is as follows:

ARTICLE II - Confession of Faith

Section 1. This church confesses Jesus Christ as Lord of the Church. The Holy Spirit creates and sustains the Church through the Gospel and thereby unites believers with their Lord and with one another in the fellowship of faith.

Section 2. This church holds that the Gospel is the revelation of God's

sovereign will and saving grace in Christ Jesus. In Him, the Word Incarnate, God imparts Himself to men.

Section 3. This church acknowledges the Holy Scriptures as the norm for the faith and life of the Church. The Holy Scriptures are the divinely inspired record of God's redemptive act in Christ, for which the Old Testament prepared the way and which the New Testament proclaims. In the continuation of this proclamation in the Church, God still speaks through the Holy Scriptures and realizes His redemptive purpose generation after generation.

Section 4. This church accepts the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian creeds as true declarations of the faith of the Church.

Section 5. This church accepts the Unaltered Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism as true witnesses to the Gospel, and acknowledges as one with it in faith and doctrine all churches that likewise accept the teachings of these symbols.

Section 6. This church accepts the other symbolical books of the evangelical Lutheran church, the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Smalcald Articles, Luther's Large Catechism, and the Formula of Concord as further valid interpretation of the confession of the Church.

Section 7. This church affirms that the Gospel transmitted by the Holy Scriptures, to which the creeds and confessions bear witness, is the true treasure of the Church, the substance of its proclamation, and the basis of its unity and continuity. The Holy Spirit uses the proclamation of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments to create and sustain Christian faith and fellowship. As this occurs, the Church fulfills its divine mission and purpose.

ARTICLE XXII - By-Laws and Amendments

Section 2. Amendments to this constitution must be presented in writing to the convention over the signature of no fewer than twenty delegates representing no fewer than five synods. Following such presentation, they shall be immediately referred for study and recommendation to the Executive Council, which shall make report thereon to the same convention if possible but which shall not be required to do so until forty-eight hours have elapsed following the presentation. Adoption of an amendment shall require passage at two successive conventions by a two-thirds vote of the delegates present and voting, and the full text thereof shall be mailed to each delegate within thirty days after adjournment of the convention first acting favorably thereon.

As one reads these doctrinal statements of these two new Lutheran bodies, the LCA and TALC, one cannot help feeling that these doctrinal statements reflect the historic theological positions of the synods which formed the mergers. There has been little change.

-- G. Reichwald

* * * * *

THE CLEVELAND CONVENTION

While one could perhaps devote considerable space to reviewing the recent triennial convention of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod at Cleveland, Ohio, we shall at this time confine ourselves to a listing of contrasts drawn up by the Rev. T. N. Teigen which point up the fact that said convention did not succeed too well in coming to grips effectively with the various issues facing it. (Ed.)

The Cleveland Convention:

a) called the essays of Dr. Scharlemann "doctrinally misleading," and at the same time judged that the "charges of false doctrine made against Dr. Scharlemann have not been sustained to date." (Res. No. 19);

b) in one resolution declared the controverted "Theology of Fellowship, Part II" "open to misunderstanding and criticism" and turned it over to a committee for restudy and possible revision (Res. No. 28), and at the same time seemed to give countenance to the practice of joint prayer "in meeting with other Lutheran bodies (not in fellowship) for the purpose of discussing doctrine."; and in another resolution resolved to continue discussions with Presbyterian bodies with the approval of joint devotions in connection with such discussions (Res. No. 5);

c) passed a resolution repudiating 13 specific errors but carefully withheld any judgment that these errors had been taught in the Mo. Synod, though this is a matter of public record (Res. No. 16; cf. e.g., the Scharlemann Papers);

d) on the one hand favored the formation of an "International Organization of Confessional Lutheran Churches" (Res. No. 1), and on the other hand authorized a movement toward the formation of National Lutheran Inter-Church Association with liberal Lutheran bodies for theological discussions and Christian service. (Res. No. 27);

e) declared that a demand that pastors and teachers sign "A Brief Statement" is unconstitutional (Res. No. 14), though the framers of the constitution of the Mo. Synod did not regard it as unconstitutional to specify that a professor subscribe to a repudiation of Chiliasm (Synodal-Bericht, 1857, pp. 53, 54, 100-103);

f) quite clearly re-affirmed the doctrine of the "Immortality of the Soul and the Resurrection of the Flesh," though in spite of clear evidence that this doctrine had been publicly denied in print, would say no more than that statements had been made that "are unclear and may be understood to have meaning not in accord with the teaching of Scripture." (Res. No. 18);

g) on the one hand re-affirmed "belief in the plenary, verbal inspiration of Scripture, the inerrancy of Scripture, and that Scripture is in all its words and parts the very Word of God, as taught in the Scripture itself and in the Lutheran Confessions" (Res. No. 16); and on the other hand declared that the very vulnerable published statement on the "Form and Function of Scripture" of the St. Louis Seminary Faculty was only a "study" document and asked the St. Louis Seminary Faculty "to continue its study of the Doctrine of Scripture with a view toward giving a more definitive statement which will more fully express its thinking on the theology of the Word, and submit this statement to the pastors of the Synod for their study in pastoral conferences that they may convey their thinking to the faculty" (Res. No. 29);

h) on the one hand steadfastly refused to acknowledge that any had been guilty of false teaching within the Synod, and on the other hand passed a resolution of

rebuke (Res. No. 32) aimed at those in the Synod who hold that its unity "has been rent by statements which conflict with the doctrine of Holy Scripture" and that "in instances of public sin, public rebuke is in order." (Book of Memorials, No. 336).

-- T. N. Teigen
Minneapolis, Minnesota

* * * * *

BOOK REVIEWS

Philippians, by William Hendriksen (Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1962, 218 pp., \$6.95).

This book is a commentary, written for the general reader, not the specialist. It is the fourth in a series--The New Testament Commentary--all by the same author, who is introduced as a former professor of New Testament literature at Calvin Seminary, and now serving as pastor of the Creston Christian Reformed Church in Grand Rapids, Michigan. That Dr. Hendriksen is an able scholar and a careful exegete is amply evidenced by his work on Philippians.

As pointed out above, his work falls into the category of the popular commentaries; and is written in a style which is highly readable, enjoyable, and devotional in tone. All purely technical details, which would be of interest only to scholars, are relegated to the footnotes--as, for example, discussions on the finer nuances of the various Greek terms; but even here the footnotes are generally very brief and not at all exhaustive.

The first 40 pages of the book are devoted to a reasonably comprehensive Introduction to the letter, which is one of the superior features of the book. Here the author's scholarship shows through more than in the main body of the book; and his discussions on the city of Philippi, the church of Philippi, the place, time, and purpose of writing are all excellent and complete. In his discussion of the authorship and unity of Philippians Dr. Hendriksen also reveals himself as a member of that rapidly diminishing group of thoroughly conservative Bible scholars. His acceptance of the Bible as the verbally inspired Word of God is something which is not implied, but stated clearly in his work; and using this as his starting point he marshals his arguments for the complete authenticity and unity of Philippians in a most convincing and scholarly fashion. All of the critical theories and arguments are reviewed and refuted ably by references to the Scriptures themselves (the internal evidence) and a good review of the writings of the early fathers (the external evidence).

As is customary these days, the translation on which the interpretation is based is that of the author himself. Here his aim is clearly evident--to be as literal as possible, and to avoid paraphrase, which has become a rather popular sport among Bible translators these days, since the appearance of Phillip's best-selling books. From this it follows that the style is not that of polished English prose. On the other hand, it is not the overly literal crude translation English found in Lenski, but couched in good, understandable, modern American English. One could simply say, "It reads well."

Each section is preceded by a brief summary of the contents, and followed by a brief synthesis which ties together the thoughts in a most satisfactory way. The general reader, especially, will find these features most edifying and worthwhile.

The commentary itself is brief (as will be seen by the size of the book), non-technical, and pitched to the tone of the devotional, as pointed out above. It is only occasionally that the author's Reformed views "show through"--mostly by his repeated use of the words "sovereignty", "sovereign", and "sovereign grace",--but most of these are not objectionable. In the much-disputed "kenosis" section (Phil. 2:5-8) the author upholds the full eternal deity of Christ in a most satisfactory way; and the concepts of "faith alone" and "grace alone" abound throughout the book. In a few cases only did this reviewer find himself unable to accept Dr. Hendriksen's interpretation--notably his insistence on the literal sense of the word "belly" in the passage which speaks about the enemies of the cross, "whose God is their belly" (Phil. 3:19). The thoroughly conservative viewpoint of the author, however, more than compensates for this and one or two other minor lapses.

For the preacher who is looking for a good, conservative, non-technical commentary on Philippians--and one which is full of good sermonic material!--this book will "fill the bill." Whether or not it is worth the rather exorbitant purchase price--\$6.95--is something each individual will have to decide for himself.

-- J. G. Anderson

* * * * *

Follow Me: Discipleship According To Saint Matthew, by Martin H. Franzmann (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., 1961, \$3.50).

The dust cover on the book carries this statement about the origin of the book: "The basic idea for Follow Me was suggested to the author by a paragraph in Adolf Schlatter's Theologie der Apostel. This paragraph indicates that Matthew gave his Christology by portraying the disciple, the man whom the Christ molds in His image." And in the preface of the book the author says: "All four of our Gospels are records of discipleship. But it is the Gospel according to St. Matthew which spells out most incisively the meaning of discipleship and gives the clearest and completest record of the impact which the divine revelation given in Jesus made on the men who were the first recipients and became the vehicles of that revelation." The aim of this brief review is to render an opinion concerning the manner in which and the degree to which Dr. Franzmann carries out his purpose of expounding the thesis enunciated above.

Much of recent theological literature is written in a language that is highly abstract and which manages to convey the impression that the author is frightfully conscious of himself and of what he is saying so that one can hardly read what he says about anyone or anything else. Dr. Franzmann writes in the current theological idiom, but with a different effect. If a historian of the year 3000 A. D. (should the history of this world still be in the making then) should happen to find a volume of this book from which the title page has been torn, he will have, we judge, little trouble in deciding that it was written by an American Lutheran theologian of the Mid-Twentieth Century. Likely the author has read and read and read the works of present-day theologians until he cannot but speak in their idiom, and there is nothing surprising about that. Having said that, one must hasten to add that Dr. Franzmann uses the current theological idiom to convey some very old and fundamental Christian and Scriptural ideas. This may seem like a quick and easy judgment; but to this reviewer Dr. Franzmann's book looks like a very old story told in a completely new and arousing way.

For the emphasis in the book is, simply put, on Jesus. The titles of the chapters may not seem to indicate that; here they are: "The Calling of the Disciple," "The Messianic Molding of the Disciple's Will," "The Disciple as Missionary and

Martyr, " "The Disciple and the Mysteries of the Kingdom," "The Fellowship of the Disciples," "The Hope of the Disciple," "The Disciple and the Death and Resurrection of His Lord: Failure and Forgiveness." But a reading of the chapters will show that they have to do with what Jesus did for the disciple, the effect that Jesus has on the disciple, the reaction that Jesus awakens in the disciple.

Along the way the old, traditional, Scriptural doctrines of Lutheranism come through. Without ever saying so in a formal way, this book teaches that the Bible is the inspired Word of God. Both Old and New Testaments are quoted profusely; Old Testament prophecies, e.g., are woven into the presentation in a telling and, to this reviewer, an entirely new way on occasion. Indeed, they are quoted according to the RSV translation, a fact dismaying to this reviewer; why a writer like Dr. Franzmann, who can make both monosyllabic and polysyllabic words sit up and shout, should wish to use a translation as insipid and starchless as the RSV is beyond understanding. But in any case, the author's use of Scripture is obviously that of a man who approaches the Bible as the very Word of God.

The old doctrines of Redemption and Justification are here; whatever your theological idiom, you cannot miss the force of words like these: "Jesus made the reach and significance of His substitutionary atoning death absolutely universal" (p. 194); "His dying is not only for man's benefit; it is in man's stead" (p. 195); "The holy will of God is, 'The soul that sins shall die.' But here a soul that never sinned, a soul that, confronted by Satan, evinced itself as pure persistence in obedience to God (4:1-11), goes into death as a 'ransom for many'. That word 'ransom' pronounces a verdict on man and his sin. . . What Jesus presupposes as the normal state of man in the parable of the Unforgiving Servant (18:23-25) is the presupposition of the word 'ransom' here" (pp. 192 & 193). On page 215 appears this statement regarding Justification: "If the Passion narrative is the disciples' confiteor, the story of the resurrection is their record of the divine absolution: 'He was raised for our justification'". The doctrine of Good Works finds expression in sentences such as these: "The Beatitudes picture the disciple both as receiving from God in pure passivity and as caught up into the motion of the God Who acts and the Messiah Who gives" (p. 41); "The disciple who ceases to minister has forfeited his existence as disciple and has destroyed himself" (p. 42). The nature of the faith that binds the disciples to Jesus comes under close examination in Chapter V under these headings: "Faith as Receiving," "Faith as Relatedness," "Faith as a Committal," "Faith as Power."

The famous passages in Chapters 16 and 18 ("Thou art Peter . . .", and "Tell it to the church") are, perhaps, treated in a manner different from the usual; but consider what these sentences say: ". . . Peter the apostle is built into the church of Christ as the Rock upon which the church rests as on its foundation" (p. 148). "The successor to Peter and his fellow apostles is not a bishop; it is the church (18:17,18). No road leads from Caesarea Philippi to Rome" (p. 149). ". . . the church is built by the Christ on faith . . ." (p. 149). "The power to forgive is given to faith; therefore it is not confined to the apostles or to any group or any office within the church. Jesus says simply, 'Tell it to the church (18:17)'. The power given to Peter and the other apostles is not hierarchy but ministry; the power they receive is theirs to transmit" (p. 155). Matthew 16 and 18 are of more than passing interest in the current Lutheran scene in America, and it is good to read an exposition like this one.

The reviewer has suggested that in writing about these and many other things in carrying out his aim of showing that the theme of St. Matthew's Gospel is discipleship, Dr. Franzmann displays a mastery of words, and he does. But it also seems that sometimes the master becomes a slave; that is, he, in the multiplying of words and phrases, scintillating words and phrases, says too much. Consider some examples: "He (Jesus) dispels the pink mists of emotional impulse with the cool air

of the realities of discipleship, with the chill fact that communion with Him means a career of self-expending ministry which reduces man to a level of comfort below that of bird and beast" (p. 2). Whew! Page 145: "His (Jesus' disciple's) life is one of action, not of contemplation." But the very book under discussion shows repeatedly that one of the effects which Jesus had on His disciples was to make them do a great deal of contemplating; it was not a case of "either . . . or" but of "both . . . and". Rather than multiply examples, let it be said that, in general, the author frequently multiplies and adds words when a little dividing and subtracting would serve his purpose better. Not that his words and phrases are not good ones; usually they are. But sometimes his language is like having someone bake a delicate and light angel food cake and then serve it to you swimming in several ounces of excellent chocolate sauce. The cake is good, and the sauce is good; but the delicate flavor of the cake is spurlos versenkt in that sauce.

Much of the book is powerful and moving; no Christian can help being caught up and carried along by it. Likely the best example of this is the conclusion of the book, the last half of page 225 and all of page 226; there is no "pink mists" stuff here; it's solid and concrete, and it heads straight for your heart. Consider one paragraph: "The Christ Whom Matthew proclaims will send us out on missionary paths that run through all the world, paths of defeat and persecution, perhaps, but also paths on which we can witness to Him, speak in the power of His Spirit, and win His victories according to His will. He can and will make us strong to face the divisions and confusions of our day undismayed. He will give us eyes to see the Kingdom when men see it not, in the Sower who goes out to sow His seed. He will give us ears to hear the footfalls of His judgment in the noisy clutter of our world and teach us to know with fear and trembling the precarious preciousness of the grace of God."

---But a review is supposed to render a judgment; here is the judgment of this inexpert and rather uncritical reviewer: It's quite a book. For all its "pink mists" and for all its abstract language, it accomplishes its aim---to show how St. Matthew describes discipleship, and much of the time it does so in an interesting, fascinating fashion.

--Stuart A. Dorr
Princeton, Minnesota

* * * * *

Archaeology and the New Testament, by Merrill F. Unger (Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1962, 350 pp., \$4.95).

It was a distinct pleasure to read this book by Dr. Unger, Professor of the Old Testament at Dallas Theological Seminary. The reader could relax, for Dr. Unger believes in the inspiration of Scripture. Archaeology, for Dr. Unger, is a powerful witness to the truth of Scripture. By carefully blending the Scriptural account with historical facts and the finds of archaeology Dr. Unger has created a book which is a valuable Bible commentary in its own right. A few question marks appeared, as when it was suggested that John the Baptist might have received his training in the Qumran community (p. 88). But the very fact that there were only a few such question marks shows that Dr. Unger has done well. The book basically covers the material of the intertestamental period, the time of Christ, and the time of St. Paul. One would do well to add this conservative book to his library to have current information.

--Glenn E. Reichwald

* * * * *

The Leaven of the Sadducees or Old and New Apostasies, by Ernest Gordon (originally published in 1926, but now reprinted as a paperback by the Church League of America, 1407 Hill Ave., Wheaton, Illinois, 263 pp., \$2.00).

Christianity and Liberalism, by J. Gresham Machen (originally published in 1923 by the McMillan Company, and reprinted as a paperback by Eerdmans of Grand Rapids, Michigan, 189 pp., \$1.75).

Thirty-one years ago the reviewer entered Concordia Seminary, St. Louis after spending a year farming. This year away from the books so whetted his appetite for them that the most exciting course he took that fall was Dr. Theodore Graebner's "Propaedeutics". The bibliography Dr. Graebner supplied was certainly "God's plenty" even when viewed thirty years later. And the most fascinating part of this course was a section dealing with "Apologetics"; no doubt because Dr. Graebner was deeply immersed in that field at the time he gave these lectures. It was a stimulating course because at that time there was no indication of the theological wavering which was to overtake Dr. Graebner in his later years. The instructor divided his notes on Apologetics under four headings: a) General Apologetics, b) Modernism, c) Evolution, d) Modern Cults. Under Modernism Dr. Graebner waxed eloquent (and he could use the English language as few in our Lutheran circles).

At his instructor's suggestion, the reviewer read, among several others, two books directed against Liberalism, namely the two listed above for review. He has never looked at them since because what with the depression being what it was, he didn't add to his library all the books that his instructors highly recommended. So, when these two books reappeared in print, a strong dose of nostalgia induced him to re-read them. They read well, excellently well, after thirty years. And one readily concurs with the notes taken during Dr. Graebner's lectures that Machen's two volumes, Christianity and Liberalism and What Is Faith "are the most brilliant books written against Modernism." Not only are they brilliantly written but they are also timely and pertinent today, even though the modernistic facade may be slightly changed from that of the Thirties.

To take up Gordon's book first, one recollects from his notes that Dr. Graebner characterized it by saying "it describes Modernism from beginning to the present age; it warns against two things: the University with its godless philosophy and endowment funds for theological seminaries. History proves that seminaries which had endowments were the first to become modernistic." Dr. Graebner's latter point is perhaps over-simplified. The point really is not that Andover Union, etc., had endowments, but that they had self-perpetuating boards of control which were sympathetic to the modernistic professors they appointed to the seminary faculty. These boards could not be touched by the church body at large, which for example at Andover appeared to be represented by a larger board called "The Board of Visitors". When the Board of Visitors found Prof. E. C. Smyth inculcating "beliefs inconsistent with and repugnant to the Creed of said institution (Andover)" (page 144) and decreed that he be removed, the Trustees defended the professor and the "Court failed to uphold the Visitor's decision" (page 144).

Chapter 6, "The Looting of Andover", and Chapter 7, "The Apostate Seminaries", are the heart of the book, with this last named chapter carrying as an ominous sub-heading this quotation from Lessing: "Und eure Weisheit macht den irren Geist noch irrer." The Apostate Seminaries examined are still the Apostate Seminaries of the 1960's: Union Theological Seminary, The Divinity School of the University of Chicago, Newton, Rochester Theological Seminary, Oberlin, Garrett Biblical Institute, and especially the Andover-Harvard Divinity School.

Andover is the classic example of the author's thesis that "the march of theological liberalism is ordinarily accompanied by more or less pillaging" (page 138). When, early in the nineteenth century, Unitarianism by means of infiltration had captured a large number of Puritan congregations in New England and also their seminary, Harvard, the evangelical-minded citizens rallied around Andover Theological Seminary, pouring into this institution, even for an inflated period such as ours, large sums of money but at the same time insisting that every professor be obliged to "subscribe to a solemn declaration of his faith in divine revelation and the fundamental and distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel as expressed in the following creed" (page 140); then came articles on the Divine Inspiration of the Scripture, the Trinity, the Deity of Christ, His Substitutionary Atonement, Justification by Faith, etc. Some of the benefactors, mindful of what had happened through the Unitarian breach of trust, had clauses in their wills that if Andover should give up these truths, the "said fund shall revert to my heirs forever."

And through the 1800's Andover prospered as a sound, scholarly and evangelical institution. But, in the latter part of the 19th Century, liberalism had so taken hold of the faculty, that five professors were charged with holding that the "Bible is not the only perfect rule of faith and practice, but is fallible and untrustworthy, even in some of its religious teachings.", etc. (page 143).

Eighty years ago, one of these five (Prof. E. C. Smyth) stated his case in language that has a strong and modern sound in this day of neo-orthodoxy: "I hold that the creed of the Seminary does not bind the institution to an antiquated phase of belief, but leads logically to those adjustments of thought and belief which are now necessary, and leaves an open path for such as the future may require. . . . I desire to secure for others after me the rights of a reverent scholarship in the study of God's Word. . . . the creed was not intended to forbid progress; it invites to progress."

The result was that soon the Board of Trustees decreed that the professors would be held only to the "substance of doctrine," and so in a few years Andover became so completely liberal that it was not difficult to merge it with Unitarian Harvard. Mr. Gordon rightly declares that "The only bright spot in the whole episode appears in a letter of Professor J. H. Thayer (of Lexicon fame) who resigned his Andover chair and betook himself to the Harvard Divinity School. Thayer, recognizing that the statutes of the Seminary required a rigid confession of the basic tenets of Christendom, felt that he must resign since he no longer strictly held to them, and he would thus lay himself open "to the charge or the suspicion of dishonesty," if he did not resign. Professor Thayer concludes this letter of resignation with the words, "But it is asked, why do you not remain at your post and labor there to bring about a change? I reply--because my obligation to be and to be known to be an honest man outweighs all other obligations to Trustees or Seminaries." (page 145).

This question we have heard time and again during the last years about more than one Seminary professor in more than one Lutheran Seminary: "Why doesn't he resign?" Certainly Thayer's procedure is admirable and worthy of emulation, but such forthright action is indeed the exception even today; instead it is most difficult to get professors who have swung over to an unbiblical point of view to resign. If the students bring charges on the basis of what they have heard in the classroom, they are usually put off, or accused of "Spying". (See Gordon, page 189 for such a dramatic incident at Rochester Divinity School).

Such refusal to resign and yet hold a contrary position to the public confession of the church is a real enigma. Such action (or lack of action) is sometimes dismissed simply as a case of "an empty belly ain't got no religion." But it is probably a little more complicated than this, although, in the final analysis it may reduce itself to this lowest common denominator. Professor Fagnani, a former professor at Union, says of heretics: "One who really cares for the church instead of resigning

and withdrawing is consciously bound to remain in and bring as many of his brethren as possible around to his way of thinking." (page 235). Still as a rejoinder to such a statement, one cannot help echoing Mr. Gordon: "The church meanwhile paying his bills while he wrecks it."

This book should be required reading for the pastors and lay people of quite a few church bodies. Every soundly Lutheran pastor will wince when Mr. Gordon reminds him of what an influential, liberal historian and theologian of a previous generation, and who, incidentally, had come out of Lutheran orthodoxy, is said to have remarked to a Pastor Quistorp. The theologian in question was Professor Ernst Troeltsch, and Mr. Gordon reports him as saying, "We cannot use force on the Evangelical church, but we have another weapon in order to overpower it. That is to appoint the greatest possible number of radical and liberal professors, and then it will, of itself and from within, go to pieces (page 145).

Dr. Machen's book has as its purpose to present the religious issue of the day as sharply and clearly as possible. His thesis, as stated in 1923, was that "Liberalism or modernism is rooted in naturalism--that is, in the denial of any entrance of the creative power of God (as distinguished from the ordinary course of nature) in connection with the origin of Christianity" (page 2). His thesis, stated in an other way, is "Whether first Century religion can ever stand in company with 20th Century science." (page 4).

Then in six brilliantly and reverently argued chapters, Dr. Machen sets forth the great essential Christian truths--inspiration of the Bible, the fall of man, the Deity of Christ, His atoning work, justification by faith, etc. Dr. Machen's Calvinism occasionally shows through his writing, but in the main, he simply elucidates the plain, simple truths of the Bible. He makes no concessions to weakness or laziness of intellect. He has laid to rest the arrogant charge of Liberals, including the present-day Neo-orthodoxists, that the "Fundies" or those who accept the Bible in its historical sense are obscurantist.

Dr. Walter Lippmann, certainly one not prejudiced in favor of historic Christianity, but certainly one intellectually respectable, writes of this book, "It is an admirable book for its acumen, for its saliency, and for its wit; this cool and stringent defense of orthodox protestantism is, I think, the best popular argument produced (in the controversy between Christianity and Liberalism). We shall do well to listen to Dr. Machen."

Although Dr. Machen aimed his book at the more optimistic modernists of the early part of this century, what he has to say is nearly as pertinent for the more somber yet still basically liberal Neo-orthodoxists today. For example, in his chapter on the Bible, he asserts that it is not only a re-affirmation of eternal truths but also a revelation which sets forth the meaning of an Act of God (cf. p. 72). This is a good antidote against all this talk that God reveals Himself only through acts and not through propositions.

On another point on which Neo-orthodoxists get very hazy, namely the resurrection of Christ, Dr. Machen insists that the resurrection of Christ was an actual event in history, "that had recently happened." "And with the event went the meaning of the event; and the setting forth of the event with the meaning of the event was doctrine. These two elements are always combined in the Christian message. The narration of the facts is history; the narration of the facts with the meaning of the facts is doctrine." (Page 29). This is a forthright statement when compared with Barth's dialectical proposition in which he holds that Christ's Crucifixion is an event of Historie, but he denies this of the Resurrection as he classifies that as Geschichte; that is, he would not regard the Resurrection as historical in the sense

that an ordinary historian would regard an event as actual, real, and datable. Bultman, of course, regards the resurrection as myth. A lesser follower of Bultman, Pastor Robert Scharlemann, wonders "Whether there is any intrinsic connection between the empty grave and the resurrection of Christ." He informs his readers that the prevailing opinion today in Germany is that "on this point the theologians are agreed. There is no necessary connection." (Compare his "Shadow on the Tomb: Motifs in German Theology of the Resurrection", Dialog, Spring, 1962, pp. 22-29.) Pastor Scharlemann then goes on to suggest that "The fear of Bultmann's critics that he is dissolving the historically factual exactly parallels the fear of Luther's critics that he was eliminating all morally responsible action." Pastor Scharlemann also sees in Bultmann's position "In unmistakable outlines the shadow of Luther." Such statements (plus many more in the article) certainly suggest that Pastor Scharlemann has great doubts that the resurrection of Christ is an actual historical event. Dr. Machen, of course, would heartily disagree with the position of Pastor Scharlemann.

And so, this book is as timely reading today as it was when Dr. Theodore Graebner recommended it over thirty years ago. One wonders, in view of recent events, whether either or both of these books would receive as warm a reception today in St. Louis as they did in the old "Propaedeutics" lectures of a generation ago.

-- B. W. Teigen

* * * * *

FT. WAYNE, 1857--CLEVELAND, 1962

"GRACE FOR GRACE," a brief history of the Norwegian Synod, in Chapter VIII, tells of the appeals of our Synod to the Church of Norway to encourage theological candidates to this country to work among the Norwegian immigrants settling in the States in increasing numbers, and says on page 69:

Although a number of pastors were gained in this way, it soon became evident that something must be done to train pastors in this country if the needs were to be met properly. This matter had been discussed even at the meetings preliminary to the organization of the Synod. At the first convention held after the organization, in 1855, Pastors J. A. Ottesen and N. Brandt were elected to visit the institutions which had already been established in St. Louis, Columbus, and Buffalo. This committee carried out its mission in the early part of 1857 and published a lengthy report in Maanedstidende. They strongly recommended the institution of the Missouri Synod in St. Louis. The convention held in October the same year resolved unanimously to negotiate with the Missouri Synod for permission to establish a professorship at their theological Seminary. It was stated in the resolution that "This temporary arrangement would bring a threefold advantage: 1) provide teachers for the Church in the near future; 2) help the Synod gain experience before starting its own school; 3) bring the Synod into contact with a church body which had been established on a truly Lutheran foundation and thus help it to become strengthened in the knowledge of Christian doctrine and of matters pertaining to church government.

The general convention of the Missouri Synod held shortly afterwards acted favorably on the request.

Had the Editors of GRACE FOR GRACE been granted the money it takes to put out a history with all the footnote apparatus, they probably would have noted among other things that the Missouri Synod acted favorably on the request of the Norwegian

Synod in Fort Wayne, Indiana, on October 22, 1857, and that the "stipulations and conditions" attached to the granting of the request are to be found in the Missouri Synod's Convention Report of that year on pages 100 and 101, where the adopted committee report reads as follows:

With regard to the work of the Norwegian theological professor it was stated that he should bring the entering Norwegian students so far in the German language that they can profitably take part in the general instruction at the institution. Furthermore he should instruct them in Norwegian, and in the Seminary take over one or several disciplines and conduct them in Latin or German. He should have the same rights and the same obligations as the other professors, and more detailed specifications in the points mentioned should be arrived at by mutual agreement.

With regard to the election of this theological professor, it was specified that the election belongs to the Norwegian Synod and the ratification to our Synod.

The prospective professor pledges himself to all the symbolical books of the Lutheran Church. With regard to this particular case it was agreed that when a certified copy of the letter of call is filed with our Synod's respective officers, they should give authorization to extend the call also in the name of our Synod.

In addition the Norwegian brethren were apprised that they should privately in a letter to the prospective professor ask him whether he accepts word for word the two parts of the Smalcald Articles, as well as whether he rejects Chiliasm. They are likewise to send him our synodical constitution for examination.

To the question whether this professor could have himself ordained in Norway on the consideration that sooner or later he might take a congregation in this country and that upon his possible return to Norway difficulties might be created if he were not ordained there, the answer was given from our side that we would make no objection, but that also we could not advise it.

Finally, with regard to the boarding charges for the Norwegian theological students, it was stipulated that if the Norwegian congregations would support the institution with gifts of love, as the Germans do it, then the same reductions should be in effect for them as for ours--but otherwise the boarding charges should be the same for them as for the non-theological students.

(Committee) F. W. Sihler, G. Seyffarth, Fr. Wyneken,
 O. Fürbringer, F. Walther, A. Biewend.
 W. Keyl,

It is of particular interest at this time to note that the Norwegian Theological Professor coming to Concordia Seminary in St. Louis was expected to subscribe in writing to a rejection of Chiliasm.

Should someone wonder what such a rejection included he might look into the same 1857 Convention Report and see on p. 25 that it included the following points: That before the Last Day a general conversion of the Jews is to be expected, a time is to be expected in which the devil would no longer have any power and influence on earth, Christ would come again visibly to rule, all people would be converted, the departed Christians would be raised to rule with Christ over the heathen. Rejected also as false and a perversion of Scripture was any interpretation of Rev. 20, Acts 1, Ps. 67, Dan. 2 and 7, and similar passages used to support any of the above named doctrines, since these doctrines are contrary to the the analogy of

faith, specifically, the articles concerning the nature of the Kingdom of Christ in the world, the general resurrection of the dead, the Last Day, and the coming of Christ to Judgment.

It might be noted that the Missouri Synod understood this rejection to be implicit in Article XVII of the Augsburg Confession. Ibid., pp. 43 and 81. (It is also of incidental interest to note that the Article, "Of the Millenium" in the Brief Statement contains the same rejections.)

It can hardly escape notice that the framers of the Constitution of the Missouri Synod did not regard it as un-constitutional to specify that a professor subscribe to a detailed rejection of Chiliasm; thus the Cleveland Convention of 1962 seems to represent a basic shift.

Other things that could be said in this connection: Had the proponents of the "un-constitutionality" argument been able to show that there is something in the Brief Statement that is not implicit in the Lutheran Confessions, there might have been some grounds for the move. Is it too late to expect that theologians of the Missouri Synod will step up in some official way to point out that all the articles in the Brief Statement are implicit in the Confessions, that the whole doctrinal history of the Missouri Synod as it pertained to particular false teachings that were very close is concisely set forth in the Brief Statement, and that in the Brief Statement is set forth how the Missouri Synod understood the Lutheran Confessions on specific matters over toward others in this country who also claimed to be loyal to the Confessions? Respect for the consecrated fathers of the Missouri Synod and respect for its Christ-centered, grace-centered Scripture-centered history and doctrine, and above all, loyalty to Christ and His One Church would certainly demand that this be done.

-- T. N. Teigen
Minneapolis, Minnesota

* * * * *