



Lutheran Synod Quarterly

THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF BODY AND SOUL WITH
SPECIAL REFERENCE TO DEATH AND RESURRECTION
The Rev. H. A. Theiste

WAS CIRCUMCISION A SACRAMENT, A MEANS OF GRACE?
(Concluded)
The Rev. A. T. Kretzmann

BOOK REVIEWS

March 1964

Volume IV, No. 3

* * * * *
 * 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 *
 * M. H. Otto, Managing Editor, % Bethany Lutheran College, *
 * 734 Marsh St., Mankato, Minnesota 56001 *
 * * * * *
 * Volume IV, No. 3 March 1964 *
 * Subscription Price: \$2.00 per year Single Copy, 50¢ *
 * * * * *

THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF BODY AND SOUL
 WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO DEATH AND RESURRECTION

This paper was prepared primarily to encourage discussion at the pastoral conference of the ELS without thought of publication. It therefore lacks in those qualities of sentence construction required of a written presentation. However, it is an honest attempt to set forth the teachings of Scripture in their pristine simplicity concerning soul and body with special reference to death and resurrection, the purpose being simply to let God's Word stand and let all glory go to Him alone.

In a recently published book "The Meaning and Mystery of The Resurrection" the author, Thomas S. Kepler, Professor of New Testament Languages and Literature at Oberlin College, states: "Paul is the father of modern psychology. . . Paul was influenced by the Old Testament and the Greek concepts of man . . . out of these two influences have come the real bases for Christian thought about human nature." The intention of this comment is to show that Paul had a different concept of man as a personality and his

relationship to the life hereafter than that set forth in the Old Testament Scriptures, and that Paul's presentation was influenced by Greek thought as expressed by the ancient pagan philosophers. The intent is to lay the ground work for denying the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the flesh, and to use Paul as a prime witness.

Certainly Paul was a scholar, thoroughly familiar with the Old Testament writings and equally conversant in the writings of the Greek philosophers. But to state that these were influences that shaped Paul's thinking "out of which has come the real basis for Christian thought about human nature" is to pervert the very testimony of Paul himself, who writes: (I Cor. 2: 12ff) "Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual." Again (v. 7) "But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory. And (v. 5) "That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God."

Some might argue that Paul is speaking only of the divine mystery of the incarnation, or redemption, to which he refers when he writes to Timothy: (I Tim. 3:16) "Great is the mystery of Godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." However, it is our conviction that Paul's words embrace everything that the Holy Spirit revealed to him in accordance with the words and promise of Christ that "when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come He will guide you into all truth: for He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear that shall He speak: and He will shew you things to come. He shall glorify Me: for He shall receive of Mine, and shall shew it unto you. All things that the Father hath are Mine: therefore said I, that He shall take of Mine, and shall shew it unto you." (John 16:13-15) This, then, includes Christ's knowledge of man. Jesus knew all about man. He did not have to be told what was in man. He was the great psychologist of the ages. This psychology, this knowledge of the inner nature of man, and the workings of man's whole being He revealed through the prophets of old. So what we have in the Old Testament and in the New Testament, is the same revelation of the nature, the psyche, of man.

To the scientist the word "psyche" designates "the life principle which animates all creatures." But in the New Testament the word $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$ is used in a distinctive sense to indicate expressly the characteristics of a human being, his personality and all that goes with it. When speaking of this $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$ as a living, active thing expressing itself through the body instrument

the New Testament uses another word, interchangeably with $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$, and that is $\piνε\upsilon\mu\alpha$. These words are used in contrast to $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$: "Body." Young's Concordance lists some 270 passages where $\piνε\upsilon\mu\alpha$ is used when speaking of "man" as a constituted being or person. The equivalent word in the Old Testament is נְפֹשׁ , translated "soul" and used in contrast to בָּשָׂר , "flesh." Some 230 passages are listed where the Old Testament uses נְפֹשׁ when speaking of man as a rational, living personality. This use of the Hebrew נְפֹשׁ is most strikingly illustrated in Genesis 2:7 "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul," נְפֹשׁ . It is indeed significant that it does not say that God formed a human being from the dust and that by His breath God made this being into a rational being, that is, gave it the ability to think, reason, etc. But God formed "man" אָדָם a human body with the members that he would require in his physical existence, but this was not more than a form of clay until God by His breath נְשָׁמָה made him a "soul" נְפֹשׁ "a living one." In this sense it is indeed true: "Man does not have a soul: Man is a soul."

The Bible Speaks of Man in Terms of Body and Soul

When the Old Testament speaks of man doing, acting, being - any manifestation of the emotions, - it speaks of the נְפֹשׁ doing this or that. For example: we say of a person "he fell in love." In Gen. 34:3 Shechem, the son of King Hamor the Hivite is said to have fallen in love with Dinah, the daughter of Jacob, in these words: "And his soul נְפֹשׁ clave unto Dinah the daughter of Jacob." In Lev. 7:20 "The soul נְפֹשׁ that eateth of the sacrifice . . . even that soul shall be cut off from his people." The person, not the "body" is cut off, put to death, that person who is distinguished by his ability to function is cut off from his people. In Daniel 7:15 "I Daniel, was grieved in my spirit נְפֹשׁ in the midst of my body גִּבְרִי ." Here the word for body specifically means "a sheath" and the contrast with "spirit" נְפֹשׁ emphasizes the fact that the person, the being who feels, loves, grieves etc., is something apart from the material appearance or form of man. נְפֹשׁ is equivalent to the Greek $\piνε\upsilon\mu\alpha$.

Turning to the New Testament we find St. Paul speaking in 2Cor. 12:2-4 of being caught up and permitted to experience the "third Heaven." Paul makes it clear that it was his person, the conscious, rational being, that was Paul which was "caught up"; but what the state of his body was at this time, or just how this separation, departure of the person from its earthly form or "tent", took place, if such was the case, he does not know. But it is clear he speaks of his person and of his body.

Jesus said: (Matthew 10:28) "And fear not them which kill the body $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$, but are not able to kill the soul $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$." Here $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ and $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ are used in contra-distinction.

In Revelation 20:4 St. John writes: "And I saw the souls ψυχάς of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus . . ." St. John did not see a phantom, or phantoms, nor did he see someone's breath, but persons, recognizable beings, but without their mutilated mortal bodies.

These examples are cited simply to affirm the Scriptures, both Old and New Testaments, speak of man as being a soul. In this material earthly existence the soul asserts its presence by means of the body. Here on earth we are a soul in a body. But when by reason of death, which passed on man because of sin, the body succumbs, the person, soul, continues to exist, not as an unidentifiable phantom or apparition, but as the person he always was. The departed having laid aside their body are called both "spirits" and "souls", indicating the terms are interchangeable. (cf. Pieper, Vol. I, p. 477)

It is objected that you cannot chop man into pieces and leave a whole man. You cannot deal with him as soul and body. This is "dichotomy", the critics say, which Paul borrowed from the Greeks and was unknown among the ancient Jews. But the Scriptural teaching is not the dichotomy of the Greeks. The Bible never indicates two different beings in one body, or a divided nature, a soul nature and a body nature. Man it says, is soul and body.

A Psychological Connection

The soul and body are "psychologically" connected. The soul is animated by the "spirit" πνεῦμα O.T. κνεῦμα N.T. Either the spirit of God or the spirit of evil. God breathed into Adam the breath πνεῦμα of life, HIS (God's) LIFE, and Adam became a living soul. By disobedience this spiritual life was lost and Adam was filled with the spirit of fear, the opposite of love, and life.

The body gets its sustenance from bread and meat. The soul lives by words and ideas. Either the life of God or the life of the devil.

Dr. F. Pieper put it in these words: "There is a psychological connection between justification and sanctification." What he means is that by the preaching of the Gospel of God's redeeming love in Christ the Holy Ghost creates a new life in the soul. The essence of this life is love to God. This life is called "Faith." When this faith in the love of God in Christ has been kindled in man's heart, which the Bible calls new birth, renewal of spiritual life in God, regeneration, man will express it in word and deed because the soul expresses itself through the body instrument. St. Paul said:

"The life that I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me." (Gal. 2:20)

Faith, the new life of soul, becomes visible and dynamic by deeds of the body. We are exhorted in Ephesians 5:2, "Walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us and offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour." This expresses the fact that faith has the power to move the soul to live the unselfish, God-dedicated life, which is just the opposite of the natural or carnal human existence. Dr. F. Pieper in Christian Dogmatics, Vol. III, p. 6 quotes Quenstedt: "By good works we understand moral actions, not merely the external ones that take place through the hand and the tongue, but also the internal, the affections of the soul with the movements of the will." Again: "The subjectum quo sanctification is the soul as to its faculties: intellect, will and desires; in a secondary sense also the members of the body in so far as they are the necessary instruments of the renewed or sanctified soul toward performing holy acts."

The same idea is expressed in the Old Testament as for example Psalm 119:32: "I will run the way of Thy commandments when Thou shalt enlarge my heart."

The words of Luther are well known: "Faith is a divine work in us that changes us and regenerates us of God (John 1:13) and puts to death the Old Adam and makes us entirely different men in heart, spirit, mind and all powers and brings with it the Holy Ghost. Oh, it is a living, busy, active, powerful thing that we have in faith, so that it is impossible for it not to do good without ceasing." (Christian Dogmatics, F. Pieper, p. 11)

Of the unconverted soul God says: "The carnal mind" (this indicates the existence of a psyche, namely the powers of reason, intellect, etc.) "is enmity against God." (Rom. 8:7) Blind to the goodness, love and mercy of God, it is incapable of loving God or serving Him with the instrument of the body. The entire being has become the slave of Satan. "Whose will you do, his slave you are" said Jesus in effect, to the Jews that sought to kill Him. (John 8:14-59)

The unconverted soul is driven by the spirit of rebellion against God, the spirit of the devil, and his soul finds the fulfillment of the desires of life in the material things of this world. Cf Luke 12:13-21: "Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry." Thus Jesus describes the rich farmer-fool. In I John 2:15-17 we are told: "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." This, then, is speaking of man as soul and body, the soul with the powers of love, etc.,

the body capable of experiencing the material things. "And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever."

This is Christian, Biblical, psychology, or science of the soul. The soul is not a disembodied thing, but the real person manifesting itself and expressing itself by means of the God-created body. As Luther says: "I believe that God has made me and all creatures; that He has given me my body and soul . . ."

Neo-orthodox theologians say: "Man is not soul and body." They deny the immortality of the soul. They say that death ends all except for those who have the resurrection experience -- and then it is not man that lives on, but just an idea. As one writer put it . . . "while in man's continuation beyond the grave the body $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ continues in the resurrection experience, apart from the flesh; flesh and blood will not inherit the kingdom of God on resurrection day." Thus corrupting altogether the meaning of this word of God which speaks of the unregenerate man not inheriting the Kingdom of God. Anders Nygren writes: "One who believes in the immortality of the soul shows thereby that he is not a Christian." Then he quotes Justin Martyr as saying: "If you have fallen with some who are called Christians . . . and who say that there is no resurrection of the dead, but that their souls, when they die, are taken to heaven; do not imagine that they are Christians." (It is rather indicative of neo-orthodox theologians that they never quote Scriptures in support of their views. And as to Justin, is it not possible that he was speaking of people who denied the resurrection of the dead as set forth in I Cor. 15, but who at the same time held to the pagan idea of disembodied spirits living in perpetuity in some spirit world?)

Prof. Gilbert Thiele of St. Louis writes: "We think it consequently fair to say, to put it very bluntly, that when a man dies he is dead. The Bible when examined in its length and breadth knows of no disembodied condition in which man lives temporarily, and certainly not permanently; it knows of neither a temporary nor permanent human immortality as such." (Seminarian, March 1958) You will note the words are carefully guarded so as to sound orthodox, but there is a denial of the immortality of the soul. I do not know of any retraction of these words. The Lutheran Witness stated, (January 20, 1964) "Confusion and misunderstanding arise in this area of last things for several reasons. One is that people often equate the philosophical concept of the immortality of the soul with the Scriptural doctrine of eternal life, which is a gift of God through Jesus Christ." Again, very carefully worded! But why this confusing of minds by playing with terms that have had confessional standing in the Lutheran Church, yes, in the entire Christian Church for centuries?

We shall now review what the Scriptures say about death and resurrection, which of course, includes the area of "immortality of the soul."

In our catechism we speak of death as the separation of the soul from the body. Dr. F. Pieper speaks of it as "The tearing apart of soul and body," and that is what makes it the horrible experience because the soul and body are psychologically connected, welded thus into one unit, one being, which makes the complete person.

The Scriptures speak of a corruption of the body at death. Genesis 3:19 "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread until thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." In Eccl. 12:7 "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the Spirit shall return unto God who gave it." We note, it is of the body God is speaking, the material that was taken out of the ground. And in many passages of the Old Testament the dead body is spoken of, not as man, but as "an unclean thing."

What, then, disobedience had brought into the world was "death," just as God had said: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," (Gen. 2:17) This death was 1) the separation of man from God, and 2) the corruption and destruction of the body which had now become subject to corruption and must also be reconstituted to enter into the fellowship of the saints in glory with God. But there is no destruction or annihilation of man, otherwise there would have been no victory for Satan, he would have been cheated, defeated by his own act. By his act he had captured man, body and soul. This was his revenge on God Who loved man dearly.

The soul torn apart from the body in death, the person, goes either into heaven or hell. This we know from the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus. Since God is the dispenser of life and death, it is not Satan who drags the soul into hell, but all souls appear before God to be placed as they have been judged.

Of the rich man in hell we read that he felt the pangs of terrible, unrelieved thirst, while evidently noting the joy and delight of Lazarus in the bosom of Abraham.

On the Day of Resurrection the soul and body shall be reunited, the body glorified, purified, like unto the body of Christ.

Paul Tillich writes: "In order to overcome the anxiety of fate and death man has invented a theory or doctrine called the immortality of the soul. In this frame of reference death becomes a kind of friend, the door to heaven. Death loses its sting, because we are told that though we die we go on living anyhow in a better world. How did we ever get the presumptuous idea that death is not the end, that we are immortal?" The answer to that question, even though Tillich does not seem to know it, lies in the very words of Jesus:

(John 10:27-28) "My sheep hear my voice and I know them, and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." or (John 11:25) "Jesus said unto her: I am the Resurrection and the Life." and (John 14:19) "Because I live ye shall live also." In two different passages in the Book of Revelation we read of the saints, the believers, being in the presence of God, though not yet united with their bodies. To the penitent thief on the cross Jesus said: "Verily, verily . . . today shalt thou be with me in Paradise."

Thomas S. Kepler, expressing the neo-orthodox view, states: "Paul does not believe in the resurrection of the flesh, though he does believe in the resurrection of the body." Another subtle approach of Satan by which he would break down the Bible truths in the name of orthodoxy. Paul said: "Now are the dead raised," and he speaks of the flesh and blood bodies. He was true to the words of the Savior, the Son of God, Who said: "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." (John 5:28-29)

We close with the God-inspired words of the apostle Paul: I Cor. 15:35-54: "Death is swallowed up in victory." The mortal puts on immortality and soul and body are with Christ forever. SOLI DEO GLORIA

H. A. Theiste

WAS CIRCUMCISION A SACRAMENT, A MEANS OF GRACE?

(Concluded)

IV

Finally, let us note the relationship between the Old Testament sacraments, Circumcision and the Passover, as compared with the New Testament sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. More specifically as far as the topic of our paper is concerned, what are the differences between Circumcision and Baptism? No doubt the deepest difference, one, however, which most people have failed to note, is this that circumcision, whose external act consisted in the removal of the foreskin, concerned itself outwardly with the propagation of offspring, since it was thru the production of a seed of blessing that the gracious covenant of God for man's salvation, at least in its preparatory form, was to be realized and

and attain its fulfillment. In this connection the remark of Clandish⁸ in the Homiletic Commentary, p. 358, is truly meaningful and significant: "Abraham is circumcised on the eve of his becoming the father of the Messiah - when the Holy Seed is to spring from him; and all the faithful are to be circumcised till the Holy Seed come. Hence one reason why the introductory seal of the covenant is superseded and another sacrament has been ordained in its place. Circumcision significantly pointed to the future birth of Christ, who was to be the seed of Abraham. The birth being accomplished, the propriety of circumcision as a sacrament ceases. Any corresponding rite now must not be prospective, but retrospective; not looking forward to the beginning of the Messiah's work, as the righteousness of God, when in His birth He was shown to be His Holy One by His miraculous conception in the Virgin's womb - but looking back to the end of His work, in His burial, and He was declared to be the Son of God with power, by His resurrection from the dead. Such a rite, accordingly, is Baptism, as explained by the apostle when he says 'We are buried with Him,' etc., Romans 6:4. Our Baptism signifies our engrafting into Christ, as not merely born, but buried and risen again. It refers not to His entrance into the world, but to His leaving it. It is the symbol, not of His pure and holy birth merely, but of the purifying and cleansing efficacy of His precious blood shed upon the cross and the power of His resurrection from the dead to His life and glory -- Both Circumcision and Baptism denote the purging of the conscience from the dead works or from the condemnation and corruption of the old nature through the real and living union of the believer with Christ - with Christ about to come into the flesh, in the one case; with Christ already come, in the other." While we must reject his presentation of the Reformed view of the sacraments as merely symbolical of the grace and forgiveness which according to Scripture is actually bestowed thru the sacraments, his comparison between the Old and New Testament sacraments is very well expressed and explained.

It might be added that the difference between the Old Testament and the New Testament sacraments is that which exists between the image and the reality. This is meant in this sense that the Passover Supper gave the meat of the Passover lamb as a symbol of Christ (who was to come); whereas the Lord's Supper offers and gives the true body and blood of Christ, the Real Presence. So also, Circumcision pointed forward to the Savior who was to accomplish the cleansing from sin offered and conveyed in this Old Testament sacrament, while Baptism, offering and conveying the same forgiveness of sins, points at the Christ who was in the process of or had already offered Himself for the forgiveness of the sins of the world. This difference is referred to by implication in the words of the apostle in Hebr. 10:19 ff: "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which He has consecrated for us --- and having an High Priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with

pure water. Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering, for He is faithful that promised."

Another significant difference between the Old Testament and the New Testament sacraments lay in the comparative amount of grace and truth respectively exhibited in and through them. While it must be admitted that it was in the Old Testament sacraments and other typical ceremonial acts then in force that the Old and New Dispensations come nearest to each other and, we might say, stand formally upon the same level, yet the amount of divine grace and truth shown and exhibited in the sacraments of both dispensations differ very much. This difference, however, is nothing more than a reflection of the difference in grace and truth manifested generally between the Old Testament and New Testament times in all other respects as well. But even though the amount of grace and truth exhibited in the Old Testament sacraments is naturally far less than that shining forth in all its brightness in the New Testament sacraments established upon the redemptive work of Christ in the process of being accomplished or already fully accomplished, this difference in the amount of light of divine grace manifest in no way detracts from the fact that also the Old Testament sacraments were true sacraments in the full sense of the word, as indicated in part III of this paper.

Chemnitz presents in detail a comparison between the Old and New Testament sacraments.⁹ For the sake of brevity, we will quote only the following short excerpts: "The institution and use of the sacraments did not begin in the time of the New Testament; but the fathers in Old Testament times, even before the giving of the Law, had certain signs or sacraments of their own, divinely instituted for this use, which were seals of the righteousness of faith. Romans 4 -- When the doctrine of the opus operatum was fabricated, they (the scholastics) invented this distinction between the sacraments of each Testament, that through the former (Old Testament sacraments) grace was only signified, but not shown and conferred, even to those who received them in the proper way (rite); while through the latter (New Testament sacraments) grace is truly shown and conferred, even if there be no good interior motive in the recipient - - - - Now this view directly point blank opposes Paul, who in Romans 4 expressly teaches and affirms that Circumcision did not justify Abraham ex opere operato, or through a kind of merit; but that it was a seal or assurance of the righteousness of faith, which has this property that it is the blessedness of that man to whom as to one who believes, not one who works, God according to His grace imputes righteousness without works, Romans 4." Gerhard also goes into this matter very thoroughly, reaching the same general conclusions.¹⁰

Now, are there any teachings of doctrinal and practical importance to us as Christians and as Christian pastors which can be derived from

our discussion of our assigned topic: "Was Circumcision a Sacrament?" As already indicated earlier in this paper, there are divine truths of major importance for our faith and for the office of the Holy Ministry to which we have been called by God which even a topic of this kind, not dealing directly with our salvation, can teach us. For one thing, the very fact that the New Testament presents the doctrines of our salvation in Christ Jesus, who was born, suffered, died and rose again for our redemption in a much more complete and clear manner than does the Old Testament, ought to cause all believing Christians of New Testament times to appreciate ever more fully how truly fortunate we are in this respect in living "anno domini," after Christ, instead of "B.C.," before Christ. Since we are called upon by the Lord to administer the sacraments of the New Testament which are so much clearer, brighter, richer and more glorious than those of the Old Testament, let us also be sure to bring home to our parishioners and to all who hear us what an abundance of divine grace are present and conferred in Holy Baptism and in the Lord's Supper. When we ourselves receive the Sacrament of the Altar (do we pastors receive it as often as we should?) let us do it with the full realization that we need this Sacrament more desperately than perhaps many of our members (if one can speak properly of one needing Holy Communion more than another believer), because we often fail so miserably in our feeble efforts to fulfill and carry out faithfully the many duties of our sacred office. Let us also prepare ourselves for the reception of this Sacrament at least as fully as we encourage our members to do so, for we need this preparation also because the danger of viewing it mechanically as an *ex opere operato* matter is at least as much present with us as it is with our members. Finally, whenever we administer either Holy Baptism or the Lord's Supper, may it always be with the full realization that it is nothing less than the fulness of God's grace which has moved the Lord to call upon us, sinful and weak and insufficient though we be, to use our weak hands to bring to other poor sinners the limitless treasures of God's grace and forgiveness so unsearchable that even the angels desire to look into them (I Peter 1:12). Realizing then, what a high and holy privilege and responsibility has been given to us as ambassadors of Jesus Christ, may we often turn to God in prayer for guidance and help for carrying out the manifold duties of the highest and holiest calling that anyone can receive on this earth. Also, in the words of a poem-prayer entitled "A Preacher's Prayer":

"I thank Thee, Lord, for using me for Thee to work and speak,
 However, trembling is the hand, the voice however weak;
 For those to whom through me Thou hast some heavenly guidance given,
 For some, it may be, saved from death and some brought nearer heaven.
 O honor higher, truer far than earthly fame could bring
 Thus to be used, in work like this, so long, by such a King!

A. T. Kretzmann

Notes

8. Homiletic Commentary, p. 538
9. Examen Concilii Tridentini, Pars Secunda, de Sacramentis, Sectio II, p. 236 ff
10. Loci Theologici, p. 175-208

Bibliography

- Lutheran Confessions, Apology of the Augsburg Confession, Trigl. pp. 147, 87f; 153, 111; 175, 80; 313, 19; 375, 42; 439, 58
 Chemnitz, Examen, p. 236 ff.
 Gerhard, Loci Theologici p. 175-208; 222-221
 Proceedings, Canadian Dist. of the Mo. Synod 1888, p. 35-36
 Proceedings, Eastern Dist. of Mo. Synod 1906, p. 27-31
 Concordia Theol. Monthly, Vol. IX, 4, p. 245-259; Vol. IX, 3, p. 171
 Homiletic Mag. III, 1, p. 1-6
 Stoeckhardt, Biblische Geschichte, Altes Testament p. 23
 Fairbairn, Typology of Scripture, Vol. I, p. 269-274
 Clandish, Homiletic Commentary, Genesis, p. 358
 G. Kittel, "Theologisches Woerterbuch Zum Neuen Testament"
 Vol. II, e-p. p. 72-83

* * * * *

BOOK REVIEWS

Meyer, Carl S., Pioneers Find Friends, Luther College Press, 1963.
 99 pages. Price \$1.75.

This book should be of considerable interest to the members of our Synod. The author is Dr. Carl S. Meyer, professor at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, who served with dedication and distinction on the faculty of Bethany Lutheran College from 1934 - 1943. The book deals with a subject which must be of interest to our Synod as long as we take our doctrine seriously, namely, the early contacts between the leaders of the Missouri and Norwegian Synods, and the arrangement for the theological training of Norwegian Synod students at St. Louis. A church body is headed for trouble when its members no longer have a desire to study the theological heritage of the past. This little book can well serve to whet the appetite, especially of our pastors, to make further studies of our Synod's history.

The immediate occasion for Dr. Meyer's book was a series of lectures which he delivered at Luther College, Decorah, Iowa, in February, 1962 as part of the centennial observance of the school which took place in 1961.

After a Foreword by Prof. H. E. Kaasa of Luther College, and a Preface and Introduction by the author, there appear the three chapters of the book:

- I. Crystal, Catfish, and Concordia.
- II. Cordiality at Concordia.
- III. Theological Concord with Concordia.

The Book also contains three valuable appendices, namely:

- A. Report of Pastors Ottesen and Brandt on Their Visit to St. Louis, Missouri, Columbus, Ohio and Buffalo, New York.
- B. Official Reports Concerning the Establishment of a Norwegian Theological Professorship at St. Louis.
- C. Letters of Walther to Koren.

There is good reason for a renewed interest these days in the old relationship of the Missouri and Norwegian Synods, apart from the Luther College Centennial. There is the present attempt to set up a new agency to replace the National Lutheran Council, and this will, if successful, bring together in an organization for joint theological study and church work the members of the Missouri Synod and a great number of those whose forefathers once marched under the confessional banner of the Norwegian Synod until the falling away under "Opgjór" (Madison Settlement) and the Merger of 1917. In addition, the Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church have agreed to hold doctrinal discussions looking toward eventual establishment of fellowship relations. Prof. Kaasa of Luther College, no doubt, has all this in mind when he writes in the Foreword: "With gratitude for the past and with a hope and a prayer for greater Lutheran unity in the future, the Luther College Press is pleased to present these lectures by Dr. Meyer." (p. V)

While the first two chapters make informative and interesting reading, it is especially the third chapter which grips our attention - "Theological Concord with Concordia." This, after all, is the nub of the matter, and the real explanation for the warm and cordial friendship between the two synods, a friendship that has been described as being like unto that of Jonathan and David, and that at a time when language and other social differences could well have served as formidable barriers to such friendship. Dr. Meyer sets

forth the common theological position of the two synods in considerable detail. Here are several quotations:

"Mutually they recognized the claims that God had on them as individuals, as members of their groups, as members in the Body of Christ." (p. 40)

"They recognized Christ as the cornerstone of the temple which God was building, with the testimony of the prophets and apostles as the foundation. They were conscious of the essence of the Church and of its fundamental unity in the Lord of the Church." (p. 40)

"They accepted the Scriptures as the basis for ecclesiastical learning and sanctified living." (p. 41)

"A study of the theology of the Word in Walther and Koren and the other leaders of the Norwegian and Missouri Synods in 1860 would be instructive. It would demonstrate a regard for the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the norm and rule and judge of doctrine as the authentic, authoritative, inspired Word of the living God. It would accent the power of this Word as a means whereby God leads men to faith in Him, a knowledge of His saving will for all mankind. The Norwegian Synod leaders had already faced Grundtvigianism in their native country, and they knew what answer they must give, as they showed in the demand for the reorganization of the temporary Norwegian Synod and a redrafting of its constitution in 1853. Largely, however, this fundamental agreement as to the nature and purpose of the Scriptures was recognized without being verbalized in this formative period of both Synods (at least so it seems). Biblicistic attitudes can be detected among a few of them. The attitude of all of them to the Scripture, however, was one of reverence before the Almighty and humility before His revelation in the Word." (pp. 41-42)

"Their Lutheranism was much more, however, than a denominational tag or label. It was a solid devotion to Luther and to that for which he had stood." (p. 42)

"If the Norwegians - without attempting to strain the simile - received a theological blood transfusion from the Missourians in the first decade of their Synod's existence and if this transfusion was successful, it was because both had the same type blood - the healthy product of Luther's theology." (p. 43)

"Norwegians and German alike prized most highly their common heritage of the Lutheran Confessions." (p. 44)

Prof. Meyer writes: "Biblicistic attitudes can be detected among a few of them." (p. 42) One wishes that he would have given a few examples of what is called "biblicistic." If the word is used in a good sense, one must say that they were all biblicists.

Dr. Meyer traces the source of the confessionalism of the Norwegian Synod leaders and finds that it does not originate with their contacts with the Missourians but rather goes back to the Confessional movement in Europe. He writes: "This Confessionalism was a product among both the Norwegians and the Germans of the Confessional movement of the nineteenth century, which produced Claus Harms, Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg, Carl Paul Caspari, Franz Delitzsch, Wilhelm Loehe, Gisle Johnson, and even Martin Stephan and J. A. A. Grabau." (p. 48) On the basis of this study, Dr. Meyer takes a justified "poke" at two modern ALC historians, Nelson and Fevold, who have attempted to explain the close relationship between the Missouri and Norwegian Synods as having been brought about by a strong influence of Dr. Walther over the Norwegian Synod leaders, and as having not been in the best interests of the Norwegian Lutherans in this country. Dr. Meyer writes: "The readiness of Nelson and Fevold to make almost a whipping boy out of the Missouri Synod because it exerted such far reaching influences on the Norwegian Synod must be questioned in the light of the interpretation here presented." (p. 53) It is here that even the footnotes in the book become very interesting. In Footnote 14, page 60, Fevold and Nelson speak of a fateful connection of the Norwegian Synod with Missouri Lutheranism. In Footnote 26, page 61, Belgum, another ALC historian, is a bit more charitable. He speaks of Dr. Walther as being an unseen force behind the Norwegian Synod from 1858 to 1886, but then adds: "Whether that force was a blessing or a curse upon Norwegian-American Lutheranism is still a controverted question." Dr. Meyer then adds his testimony in the following words: "The present writer's hypothesis would demonstrate that this encounter was 'inevitable'." If we understand Dr. Meyer's book at all, he is saying that the encounter between the Missouri and Norwegian Synods was inevitable for the simple reason that they were both truly loyal to the Lutheran Confessions and thus were agreed in doctrine, and thus could not but acknowledge one another as brethren in the faith and work together in their spiritual tasks. We are constrained to say that this was a very fine bit of confessional testimony to drop in the lap of the modern Luther College on the occasion of its Centennial.

In these days of many church mergers as well as a few instances of the dissolution of church fellowship relations it is easy to become a bit cynical and to suppose that whenever two church bodies merge or at least declare

fellowship relations there must have been a compromise of doctrine, and that whenever church bodies suspend fellowship relations it must be due to a clash of personalities among certain church leaders, committees, etc. Dr. Meyer's position in his book encourages one to believe that it is possible for two church groups to acknowledge one another as brethren in the faith on the basis of a common theology, a real agreement in doctrine. One would also be led to believe from this that it is possible for two church bodies which have been in fellowship to separate for the simple reason that they no longer are agreed in doctrine, and have not been able to reestablish the unity.

There are a few critical comments on the work which we might pass on to our readers, but these are in no sense to be understood as detracting from our pleasure and agreement with the main thesis of the book, that is, that their common theology attracted the Norwegians and Missourians to each other.

One wonders if Dr. Meyer, in tracing the confessionalism of the Norwegians, doesn't give too much credit to German confessionalism. No one will dispute the fact that Thistedahl was an important figure in the growing confessionalism in Norway. But one might question Dr. Meyer's statement: "What were the influences which shaped Thistedahl's theological thinking? He was influenced, Gerhard Belgum points out, by Gottfried Christian Luecke." (p. 48) The fact of the matter is that as a Lutheran Thistedahl was way ahead of Luecke, and was a good Lutheran before he ever went to Göttingen. While Thistedahl recognized in Luecke a closer approach to the older orthodoxy, he also heard from Luecke "so much that displeased him." (Olaf Kolsrud, BIBELOVERSÄTTEREN CHRISTIAN THISTEDAHL, page 58)

On page 36, Footnote 1, there is a slip regarding dates. "December 22, 1854" should read "December 22, 1859."

On page 40, "Kindly old Friedrich Wyneken" was but 53 years old at the time, having been born in 1810.

On page 44, second paragraph, second sentence, the date should be 1858 instead of 1853.

On page 48, mention is made of the influence of Caspari and Johnson on the early leaders of the Norwegian Synod. It should be pointed out that some of these men had very little contact with Caspari and Johnson at the University of Christiania. Caspari began lecturing in 1848, and Johnson in 1849. A. C. Preus finished the Theological School in 1841, and H. A. Preus in 1848. H. A. Preus had no lectures from Caspari

and only private lectures from Johnson.

On page 50, it is mentioned that Caspari was baptized by F. A. Wolff. Caspari was instructed by Pastor Wolff, but was actually baptized by a brother-in-law of Wolff, a Pastor Zehme.

On page 52, it is stated that Thistedahl assisted Caspari and Johnson in the translation of the Old Testament and the Book of Concord into Norwegian. Actually, Thistedahl did the main work in the translation of the Old Testament.

On page 79, there is a little editorializing in the translation of the Ottesen Brandt report when it says: "The Missouri Synod stresses the notion that the church is invisible..." The text simply says that the Missouri Synod "udhaver at Kirken er usynlig..." (stresses that the Church is invisible...)

On page 86, a sentence is left out at the end of the fourth paragraph, namely: "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."

On page 96, the letter of September 12, 1881, said to be from Walther to Koren. The internal evidence would seem to indicate that this letter is rather from Walther to Larsen. Lehman of the Ohio Synod ceased to be president of the Synodical Conference when Ohio withdrew from the Conference, and Larsen, the vice-president became president.

There is an interesting bit of history with an application for the present day in Appendix B which deals with the official reports concerning the establishment of a Norwegian Theological Professorship at St. Louis. The Missouri committee, consisting of such stalwarts as F. W. Sihler, O. Fuerbringer, W. Keyl, G. Seyffarth, F. Walther, Fr. Wyneken, and A. Biewend, reports among other things the following:

In regard to the election of the designated professor of theology it was agreed that election belonged to the Norwegian Synod and ratification to ours. The one to be elected obligates himself to all the symbols of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. In regard to this particular point, it was agreed, that, if our Synod, i.e., its officials, are presented an attested copy of the call-document, they should suppose authority to complete the call in the name of our Synod. Furthermore, the Norwegian brothers were asked to ask the recipient of the call, privately in a letter, if he accepts both appendices to the Smalcald Articles literally, if he repudiates Chiliasm. Also our Synodical constitution is to be sent him for perusal." (pp 86-87)

These distinguished leaders of Missouri did not hesitate to arrange for the assurance that a future teacher in their seminary not only subscribed to the Lutheran Confessions, but specifically rejected Chiliasm as well. To require anything in addition to subscription to the Confessions would hardly be allowed in modern Missouri. Cf. the fate of Resolution No. 9, 1959, San Francisco, regarding subscription of Missouri Synod professors to the Brief Statement, at the Cleveland Convention, 1962.

The lectures and book were subsidized by the Lutheran Brotherhood Insurance Society of Minneapolis. Perhaps this group could be interested in subsidizing a series of lectures and the printing of a book describing the relationship between the Missouri and Norwegian Synods in the years and days preceding the Merger of 1917, culminating in the Missouri Synod's recognition of the Minority, who organized what is now the Evangelical Lutheran Synod, as true brethren. This could be another fine contribution to the past historical scene among Lutherans in America.

To date we have seen no publicity or reviews of Dr. Meyer's book. Perhaps there have been some and we have missed them. We surely hope that both the Missouri Synod and the ALC publications will promote this book in the interest of an appreciation of past Lutheran Church history and the lessons to be gained thereby. Surely all our ELS pastors should purchase the book and give it the close study it deserves. It can furnish material for interesting discussions in our local pastoral conferences. We believe that many of our lay people also are able to appreciate the book.

Theodore A. Aaberg

Barackman, Paul F., The Epistles to Timothy and Titus, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1962, 155 pp., \$2.95

This little volume is a part of a series published by Baker's entitled "Proclaiming The New Testament," which would no doubt be classified as a series of homiletical commentaries. In the editor's Foreword, however it is avowed that this is not a commentary in the usual sense of the word, nor is it a Bible study book, with which the market is glutted, nor is it a book of outlines, of which there is also no lack. The editor advertises this series as an attempt to provide the busy preacher with homiletical comments and ideas. In the opinion of this reviewer Prof. Barackman has adequately fulfilled this intended purpose.

Prof. Barackman, who occupies the chair of English and Preaching at Biblical Seminary, New York, is evidently a conservative, insofar as one can judge the man from his writing. He begins, for example, by telling the reader that he accepts completely the Pauline authorship of the pastoral letters, which is so widely denied today in liberal circles. He also holds the traditional view of Paul's two Roman imprisonments, dating I Timothy and Titus between these two, and II Timothy during the last imprisonment, just prior to Paul's death.

The author reminds his reader, who is apt to be, as described above, a busy preacher, that the pastorals are of particular value and interest to the 20th century preacher. The letters themselves are what might be styled "occasional" literature - written to deal with certain specific problems of the day; but many of these problems which faced Paul and his two young friends in the 1st century are still very much in the forefront today. For example, the maintenance of purity of doctrine in the church, and the maintenance of a high degree of sanctification among professing Christians are still of prime significance in this 20th century. They are, as Prof. Barackman point out, not only the concern of the pastor, but also the people in the pews.

Remembering that this is not intended to be an exhaustive commentary, the author begins with a two-fold statement of purpose - 1) to give the preacher suggestions and ideas; and 2) to encourage the preacher to preach right through a whole book in a continuous fashion. We would observe that there is far too little of this sort of preaching done today.

To this end the book is divided into 30 short sections, each running about 4 or 5 pages. Fifteen of these are devoted to I Timothy, 10 to II Timothy, and 5 to Titus.

Each section is then treated under five headings - 1) Historical setting, which is always brief, but generally good; 2) Expository Meaning, which is a very brief study of the more important words or phrases, also generally adequately done; 3) Doctrinal Value, which is consistently very weak and thin, there being precious little "doctrine" discussed at all, most of it being a series of ethical exhortations; 4) Practical Aim, which is generally good; and 5) Homiletical Form, which is by far the best part -- also the largest. In this last part, each pericope is covered by giving it a suggested theme, some suggested material for an introduction, and a suggested outline, which is expanded by the author so as to fill it with all sorts of suggestions and ideas -- many of them useful and stimulating.

As advertised, the book is written in a thoroughly practical manner, with a simple, clear and effective style. It should be a useful tool on the busy pastor's shelf.

J. G. Anderson

Clark, Gordon, et al., Can I Trust My Bible? Chicago: Moody Press, 1963. 190 pp. \$3.50

Eight evangelical scholars answer such questions as "How may I know the Bible is inspired?" or "Is the text of the New Testament reliable?" in this book intended primarily for laymen. The pastor will find this a useful book to give inquiring members who ask about inspiration, miracles, textual reliability of the Bible, or its historical accuracy. The book is not so deep that they will go in beyond their depth. A few judicious question marks along the margin will add even more value to the book, as when the conversion of Israel is assumed, p. 115, or when one of the writers speaks of the possibility of an extended time for creation, p. 60.

Glenn E. Reichwald

Tenney, Merrill C., The Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary, Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1963. 928pp. and 23 maps, \$9.95

Conservatives have been hard pressed to find good Bible dictionaries. This dictionary appears as an answer to their needs. In sample selections such as "Isaiah" and others the writers of the articles uphold a conservative position. It is a one-volume library of conservative information which seems to reflect the best of scholarship. There are also some articles in the dictionary which are more doctrinal, such as "Lord's Supper." Here the Lutherans are still associated with the term consubstantiation. Such small weaknesses, and there are a few others, do not detract from the overall worth of this fine book. Certainly the many pictures and fine maps both within and at the end of the book also add to its worth.

Glenn E. Reichwald

Pelikan, Jaroslav, From Luther to Kierkegaard, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1963. 171 pp. \$1.75

This is a paperback reprint of the hard cover edition which appeared in 1950. At that time this book received a negative review in this journal. Readers are referred to the Clergy Bulletin, X, pp. 76ff. (April, 1951).

Glenn E. Reichwald

Stellhorn, August C., Schools of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod.
St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1963, 507 pp. \$6.75

Dr. Stellhorn, who has served the Missouri Synod in the field of Christian day school education for many years, presents his labor of love, a history of the school system which he helped develop. He does this in a combination topical, chronological approach. Those who are interested in the development of Christian elementary education would do well to read this book to profit from the experiences of others.

Glenn E. Reichwald

De Koster, Lester, Vocabulary of Communism, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans
Publishing Company, 1964, 224 pp. \$3.50

Those interested in digging into the real meaning of Communist terms and in acquiring an acquaintanceship with Communist personalities of the past and present will find invaluable help in this book. Definitions which Communists have imposed upon words such as democracy are clearly explained. The book is also thoroughly cross indexed. Interesting facts are brought out also, such as that Marx wished to dedicate Vol. I of Capital to Darwin, since Marx felt that Darwin's theories illustrated his economic theories.

Glenn E. Reichwald

Hoekema, Anthony, The Four Major Cults, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963,
447 pp. \$5.95

Dr. Hoekema, Professor of Systematic Theology at Calvin Theological Seminary, examines the teachings of Mormonism, Seventh-Day Adventism, Christian Science, and the Jehovah's Witnesses in this very complete book. The same general pattern is followed in the treatment of each group. After giving a history of the group and its founders, Dr. Hoekema treats their teachings under topics such as source of authority; doctrines of God, man, Christ, salvation, Church and sacraments, and last things; and also special peculiarities of these groups. He concludes his book by defining the characteristics of cults and how an evangelical pastor may approach them. The bibliographies are current, so that the reader can be certain of the accuracy of the material. Dr. Hoekema, it should be added, does not share the opinion held by some that Seventh-Day Adventism has become an evangelical denomination.

Glenn E. Reichwald

Douty, Norman F., Another Look at Seventh-Day Adventism, Grand Rapids:
Baker Book House, 1962, 224 pp. \$3.50

This book is another one in the many which have been appearing recently about Seventh-Day Adventism and its claims to be an evangelical

group. Pastor Douty, a Baptist minister in Lansing, Michigan, has waded through the tremendous mass of Adventist literature to permit the Adventists to speak for themselves on what they teach. All of the old peculiarities of doctrine which made Seventh-Day Adventism a cult are shown to be present today. Any pastor troubled by the Adventist movement would find very useful information here.

Glenn E. Reichwald

Watts, J. Wash, A Distinctive Translation of Genesis, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1963, 154 pp. \$1.75

The translation offered in this paperback was made by Professor Watts of New Orleans Baptist Seminary, where he is professor of Hebrew and the Old Testament. The translation is intended primarily for those who know their Hebrew, for it is intended to bring out some of the niceties of Hebrew. At times the reader will disagree with the translation, as when in Genesis 49:10 "Shiloh" is translated in a footnote as "He to whom it belongs."

Glenn E. Reichwald

Schmieding, Alfred, Sex in Childhood and Youth, St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1953, 149 pp. \$1.50

This is a paperback reprint of the earlier hard cover edition with which many of our readers are familiar. The title explains the book. A limited number of changes have been made to bring the book up to date.

Glenn E. Reichwald

Strommen, Merton P., Ph.D., Profiles of Church Youth, Concordia Publishing House, 1963, 356 pp. \$5.95. Order from the Lutheran Synod Book Company, Bethany Lutheran College, 734 Marsh St., Mankato, Minnesota

Here is a book which we believe every pastor could profitably use in carrying out his mission of preaching the Gospel to every creature. It will be profitable for him to read and study because it will help him to understand how better to administer to the youth of his church.

This book, a Ph.D. dissertation, reports the findings of a four year study of Lutheran Youth (1958-62). It is an effort to present a picture of youth that comes from the young people themselves and also from adult lay-leaders, pastors, and youth officers. Youth from the following churches were studied: American Lutheran, Evangelical Lutheran, Lutheran Free, United Evangelical Lutheran, Augustana Synod and Missouri Synod.

While a study such as this may be deficient in several respects, one can hardly push it aside as being of no significance, for the simple reason that so much material has been gathered and analyzed. From his own observations and experiences with his youth, the individual pastor may have gained a different profile of Lutheran youth from that of Dr. Strommen, but in trying to serve the youth under his care, the individual pastor would certainly want to check his findings against those of this researcher. One might feel that possibly the right questions have not been asked, or possibly they were not framed in the way the pastor may have framed them, but, be that as it may, the information here given is staggering.

Dr. Strommen's findings reveal some strong and weak points. For example, the author asserts that, "Most youth are aware of a deep sense of need and want help from the Church" (p. 235). The most troubling of all of youth's concerns, declares Dr. Strommen, are, "The feelings of self-disparagement, a sense of failure" (p. 237). Next is the youth's concern over, "Their feeling of apartness from God" (p. 237).

With regard to the beliefs of youth, Dr. Strommen states that, "Though most Lutheran youth hold a conservative theology as defined in the Ecumenical Creeds, their concepts are generally oriented toward human achievement . . . Many feel that God's favor is won by being good, that forgiveness is gained by one's confession. Some of those who perceive the doctrine of justification by faith, show a theology that is more Arminian than Lutheran" (p. 243).

This finding should not surprise us in the least, because we know, as Luther says, that everyone of us has an unshorn monk in his bosom. We ought to examine ourselves as to whether we are preaching and teaching the Law and the Gospel in the way God wants us to. Do we emphasize and expound God's Grace in Christ as clearly as we ought to? Does it receive that overriding emphasis that it ought to have in a soundly Lutheran Theology?

As a help to us in our work, we should take note of one of Dr. Strommen's findings: "Between ALC and MS youths, however, the differences were considerable. As mentioned previously, these differences may be attributed to (the) amount of parochial school training. Where training was extensive...scores were considerably higher" (p. 60). Dr. Strommen then draws this conclusion: "Thus, parochial education is related to the greater perception of propositional truth" (p. 60). Although this last remark may not have been so intended, it does sound somewhat snide to us, especially since many of Dr. Strommen's colleagues are so extremely vocal in decrying what they call the "assumption that truth can be expressed adequately in propositional form" (cf. Theology in The Life of The Church, p. 25). Certainly, every good Lutheran believes that faith is more than mere head knowledge. The aspects of saving faith, as our Dogmaticians have always insisted, are not only notitia and assensus, but also fiducia. With regard to the matter of "a greater perception of propositional truth," we shall agree whole-heartedly with Martin Luther, who said this regarding propositional truth: "To take no pleasure in assertions is not the mark of a Christian heart; indeed, one must delight in assertions to be a Christian at all...And I am talking about the assertions of what has been delivered to us from above in the sacred Scriptures... Take away assertions, and you take away Christianity" (cf. The Bondage of The Will, pp. 66, 67).