

Lutheran Synod Quarterly

Theological Journal of the
Evangelical Lutheran Synod

Edited by the faculty of
Bethany Lutheran Theological Seminary
447 North Division Street
Mankato MN 56001

Editor	Pres. Wilhelm Petersen
Managing Editor	Pres. Wilhelm Petersen
Book Review Editor	Prof. Adolph Harstad
Typesetting	Jesse M. Jacobsen
Printer	Quick Print Mankato, MN

Subscription Price \$8.00 U.S. per year

Send all subscription and other correspondence
to the following address:

BETHANY LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ATTN LUTHERAN SYNOD QUARTERLY
447 N DIVISION ST
MANKATO MN 56001

September 1995 • Volume 35, Number 3
ISBN 0360-9685

1. Introduction

The first part of the document discusses the general principles of the project and the objectives of the study. It outlines the scope of the work and the methodology used to collect and analyze the data.

The second part of the document presents the results of the study. It includes a detailed description of the data collected and the analysis performed. The findings are presented in a clear and concise manner, highlighting the key results and their implications.

The third part of the document discusses the conclusions drawn from the study. It summarizes the main findings and provides a final assessment of the project. The author also discusses the limitations of the study and offers suggestions for further research.

The fourth part of the document contains the references and the appendix. The references list the sources used in the study, and the appendix provides additional information related to the data and the analysis.

The document is written in a clear and professional style, using a standard academic format. The language is precise and the structure is logical, making it easy to read and understand.

Foreword

This issue of the *Quarterly* begins with a sermon by the editor which was delivered to the seminary graduates of Bethany Lutheran Theological Seminary on Synod Sunday evening, June 18, 1995.

Also included is an exegetical treatment of II Corinthians 5:16-21 entitled *Ministry of Reconciliation* by Pastor Martin Teigen. He points out that "God's reconciliation of the world to himself and the ministry of reconciliation that he has given to men are masterfully drawn together in a carefully constructed paragraph so that the intimate relation between these prominent themes of Paul's theology stands out most clearly." The God who effected the reconciliation of the world to himself is the same one who instituted the ministry of reconciliation. Pastor Teigen serves Our Savior's Lutheran and Rock Dell Lutheran Churches, Belview, Minnesota.

In the essay *Creation* we hear a voice from the past, that of Dr. Walter A. Maier of Lutheran Hour fame. He delivered this essay to the 37th convention of the Iowa District of the Missouri Synod which was held August 20-24, 1934. Dr. Maier upholds the Scriptural doctrine of creation and goes into considerable detail on each day of the creation week as recorded in Genesis. The message of this essay is as timely today as when it was delivered. Evolution has always been in direct conflict with God's revelation of the beginning of the world and mankind, in fact, the battle for God's truth begins with the Genesis account of creation. We would do well to study this essay.

The article *Jesus' Prophecy Concerning His Death and Resurrection* by Dr. William Kessel clearly and convincingly shows that Jesus truly is the Son of God. He shows how these prophecies tie together the Old and New Testament. The Old Testament supplied ample information about the Messiah's birth and also provided a wealth of detail about his death and resurrection. The author also points out that "both form and redaction critics conclude that while Jesus may well have known that he was going to be put to death, he could not have known the precise details. In essence this denies the omniscience of Jesus and his deity." Dr. Kessel is a professor at Bethany Lutheran College and an adjunct professor of Bethany Lutheran Theological Seminary.

Seminary Graduation Sermon

June 18, 1995

by Wilhelm W. Petersen

“The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully.” (Jeremiah 23:28)

In Christ Jesus, dear fellow-redeemed, and especially you the graduates of Bethany Lutheran Theological Seminary, grace be unto you and peace from God our Father and our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

The long-awaited day has arrived. No doubt there were times along the way when you wondered if the day of graduation would ever come. It has been a long haul, but you have persevered and today is indeed a happy day for you and your families. It is also a happy day for our synod as six more laborers stand ready to enter the Lord’s harvest.

It was your desire to preach the saving Gospel of Jesus Christ that motivated you to study for the ministry. The seminary has provided you with a theological education and has thus helped to make that desire a reality. And now as you go forth to be ambassadors for Christ, your Lord has a message for you that is as clear as it is direct, namely

“Speak My Word Faithfully”

You do that, first of all, when you proclaim that word in its full truth and purity, not adding anything to it nor diminishing aught from it, remembering always that it is God’s word. “He that hath my word” says our text, that word of which the apostle Paul writes, “All scripture is given by inspiration of God,” (II Tim. 3:16) that word of which Peter says, “The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.” (II Peter 1:21) Therefore, it is God’s verbally inspired, inerrant word — our only authority in doctrine and life — which you are to proclaim. Nothing else will do; there is no substitute. We do not have the liberty to edit that word, but we are to proclaim it as it has been revealed to us, in its full truth and purity.

This reminder is in order because there have always been those who preach their own ideas, or the thoughts of others, rather than the word of God. There were preachers in Jeremiah’s day of whom the Lord complained. In the words

preceding our text we hear a litany of complaints: “they walk in lies” v.14; “they speak a vision of their own heart and not out of the mouth of the Lord” v.16; “I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran: I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied” v.21; “they are prophets of the deceit of their own heart.” v.26. But the Lord says in our text, “the prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully.”

The situation in our day is very similar to that of Jeremiah’s day. The theological climate in the visible church is that comparatively few pastors still hold to a verbally inspired, inerrant word: in fact that word “inerrancy” is bandied about in our day, with many even in the Lutheran church saying that inerrancy applies not to the bare text but rather to the purpose for which it was written. This view does violence to the Bible and allows one to reject much of what Scripture actually teaches. But when God says **SPEAK MY WORD FAITHFULLY** he means what he says, in fact he has this word of warning to those who take liberties with his word: “Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven: but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name: and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me ye that work iniquity.” (Matthew 7:21-23) Therefore, it is incumbent upon us to speak God’s word in its full truth and purity.

Secondly, to speak God’s word faithfully, means rightly to divide the word of truth, properly distinguishing between Law and Gospel. The apostolic injunction is, “Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.” (II Tim. 2:15) The two chief doctrines of the Bible are the Law and the Gospel and they are as opposite from each other as night is from day; they serve a completely different function. Simply put: the function of the Law is to show us our sinfulness and the function of the Gospel is to show us our Savior from sin. Our Lutheran Confessions state it this way: “These are the two chief works of God in men, to terrify and to justify and quicken the terrified. One or the other of these words is spoken through the Scripture. One part is Law, which reveals, denounces, and condemns sin. The other part is the Gospel, that is, the promise of grace in Christ.” (AP, Art. XII, par. 53, Tappert p. 184)

It is necessary that both Law and Gospel be preached for a proper understanding of the Scriptures. Dr. Walther correctly observes that “the primary requisite for a salutary understanding is a correct understanding between the

Law and Gospel. But the moment we learn to know the distinction it is as if the sun were rising upon the Scriptures and we behold its contents in the most beautiful harmony.” This distinction is also necessary, as Walther points out, because “without the Law the Gospel is not understood; without the Gospel the Law benefits us nothing.” And Luther says that if we preach remission of sin without repentance, that is, the Gospel without the Law, people are made secure and unconcerned.

At the time of the Reformation there was a group known as the Antinomians who held that the Law was not to be preached. They maintained that the Law was for the jail house and court house, not the pulpit. Luther lashed out against these people showing that this was “a greater error and sin than all error of former times,” namely the error of the papacy. That’s how seriously Luther viewed antinomianism. Dr. Koren, a theological leader of the old Norwegian Synod, expressed it well in these words: “If we preached only concerning forgiveness but not repentance, then that doctrine would neither be understood, nor would it bear fruit. For without repentance there is no faith and consequently no justification by faith and to such souls ‘justification by faith’ will be only an empty phrase or a soft pillow — oftenest both.” To speak God’s word faithfully, both Law and Gospel are to be preached, but with due distinction.

Thirdly, faithful preaching of God’s word also means to proclaim it in such a way that it comforts the hearts of the hearers. Walther says that one of the chief characteristics of a sermon is “to grip the heart of the hearer.” He says that a sermon may be ever so well constructed, it may be free of false doctrine, and yet there is something missing when it fails to grip the heart of the hearer. He also laments that many sermons shoot their arrows over the heads of their hearers, leaving the heart of the hearer cold wondering what the preacher said, or tried to say. Luther complained that worse than sects are “smart preachers” who preach over the heads of people. One such preacher was a man named Osiander. He was a scholar with a keen intellect and an orator without peer, but he could not communicate with the common people. Luther called his preaching “pompous, deep, remote.” In contrast he referred to Veit Dietrich and Dr. Link as preaching in such a way that the common people were edified and could take something home with them.

In other words a preacher should be so immersed in the truths of Scripture that when he ascends the pulpit his fervent desire is “to pour out his heart to his hearers.” Then his sermons will not be dull, dry lectures nor a cold recitation of facts, but they will be spiritually-uplifting, and faith-strengthen-

ing. Walther gives this advice: "Do not stand in your pulpits sad-faced, as if you were bidding men to come to a funeral, but like men that go wooing a bride or announcing a wedding."

The most effective and exciting preacher that ever walked this earth was Jesus of Nazareth. He made use of parables and illustrations from every day life to teach spiritual truths and applied the word in such a way that his hearers said, "No man ever spake like this." Recall how on Easter Sunday afternoon he appeared to two of his disciples on the road to Emmaus and talked with them about the recent events in Jerusalem "and beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." (John 24:27) After he left them they said to one another, "Did not our hearts burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the scriptures?" (Luke 24:32)

When your people come to church they come with their burdens and feelings of guilt. As you expound the scriptures to them, send them home with the assurance that they have a Savior from sin, that where they have failed he has succeeded by leading a perfect life in their stead and by taking upon himself the punishment which they deserved and went to the cross where he paid their sin-debt in full. Yes, may your hearers experience what they often sing,

"From Thy house when I return,
May my heart within me burn,
And at evening let me say
I have walked with God today."

Finally, to speak God's word faithfully means to preach it with a view toward reaching as many souls as possible, in other words being mission-minded. Not only are we to be faithful to the word, but also with the word. In our day we hear much about the Church Growth Movement where the emphasis is on gaining large numbers by slick methods rather than through the means of grace, through which the Lord alone builds his church. Our synodical president said it well in his report to the convention where commenting on our mission program, he said,

In our church body we do not resort to so-called "church growth methods." We do not rely on psychology, sociology or gimmicks to bring people into the kingdom of God. We do not support those who wish to throw out the liturgy, drop the name Lutheran, and resort to entertainment methods to attract people. We have the sure confidence that it is

the word of God and the sacraments which produce and strengthen faith in the hearts of people. Our missionaries therefore go forth to preach and to teach that the Lord will work through the means of grace.

Having said that numbers are not the important thing, yet they are important. They are important to God, so important that He sent His Son to redeem all people, not one single person excluded. It is His will that "all be saved and come unto a knowledge of the truth." He does not desire the death of the wicked. And the Holy Spirit saw fit to record some numbers in the book of Acts where we read, "And the hand of the Lord was with them: and a great number of people believed, and turned to the Lord." (Acts 11:21) And again, "But the word of God grew and multiplied." (Acts 12:24) The apostle John, in the book of Revelation, saw "a great multitude, which no man could number... stand before the throne and the Lamb." (Rev. 7:9)

In addition to faithful preparation of your sermon during the week, there should also be a serious attempt, motivated by a love for souls, to seek the lost, bring back them that have gone astray, and to look for those "other sheep" which as yet are not part of the fold. Computers and E-mail can be a blessing, but there is also a temptation of spending too much time with these marvels of high-tech that we fail to make calls trying to reach the unchurched. It is easy to develop a negative complex and crawl into a shell and be content with the status quo. We dare not let our opposition to the Church Growth Movement be an excuse for doing nothing. No, it is incumbent upon us to take the Great Commission seriously and do this now while it is day. Have the positive attitude of the missionary William Carey who said, "Expect great things from God; attempt great things for God" that is, think in terms of reaching as many souls as possible with the life-giving gospel, not for self-glory but for the glory of God.

May God give you the grace to speak his word faithfully by preaching it in its full truth and purity, properly distinguishing between Law and Gospel, making certain that the Gospel predominates so that it truly comforts the hearts of your hearers, and attempting to reach as many souls as possible. Then your ministry will be truly God-pleasing and a blessing to blood-bought souls. Amen

ELS Circuit 8 Pastoral Conference

**Mt. Olive Lutheran Church
Mankato, Minnesota
May 18-19, 1995**

2 Corinthians 5:16-21

The Ministry of Reconciliation

by Martin Teigen

In Second Corinthians 5:16-21 God's reconciliation of the world to himself and the ministry of reconciliation that has he has given to men are masterfully drawn together in a carefully constructed paragraph so that the intimate relation between these prominent themes of Paul's theology stands out most clearly.¹

16 Ὡστε ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐδένα οἶδαμεν κατὰ σάρκα· εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν, ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι γινώσκουμεν. 17 ὥστε εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις· τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθεν, ἰδοὺ γέγονεν καινὰ.² 18 τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ καταλλάξαντος ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ διὰ Χριστοῦ καὶ δόντος ἡμῖν τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς, 19 ὡς ὅτι θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ, μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν καὶ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς. 20 ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ οὖν πρεσβεύομεν ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος δι' ἡμῶν δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, καταλλάγητε τῷ θεῷ. 21 τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ. (Nestle-Aland, Novum Testamentum Graece, Ed. XXVI)

16 Therefore, from now on, we regard no one according to the flesh. Even though we have known Christ according to the flesh, yet now we know Him thus no longer. 17 Therefore, if anyone is in Christ, he is a new creation; old things have passed away; behold, all things have become new. 18 Now all things are of God, who has reconciled us to Himself through Jesus Christ, and has given us the ministry of reconciliation, 19 that is, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to

Himself, not imputing their trespasses to them, and has committed to us the word of reconciliation. 20 Therefore we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God were pleading through us: we implore you on Christ's behalf, be reconciled to God. 21 For He made Him who knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him. (NKJV)

1. The Place of 5:16-21 in Second Corinthians

- a. 5:16-21 belongs to a parenthesis in the first section of Second Corinthians.

The argument of Paul in Second Corinthians is developed in the following manner:³

Chapters 1-7: My plans to go to Corinth were changed, not due to any fickleness on my part but due to unforeseen circumstances, i.e., I had to find Titus.

Chapters 8-9: My purpose for coming to Corinth remains the same, namely to gather the offering for the needy Christians in Judea.

Chapters 10-13: I must say something about those so-called apostles who have been saying bad things about me.

Commentators divide the first section(1-7) in various ways. Some try to find a logical sequence in it. A more productive way of dividing that section is to see 2:14 through 7:4 as a lengthy parenthesis or digression.⁴ Regardless of the manner in which the section is divided, it is certain that the sub-section 2:14-7:4 deals almost exclusively with the matter of one particular ministry. Furthermore, Paul, by arranging the letter the way he has, has segregated things in such a way so that there can be no confusion about what he is talking about when he speaks of that ministry.

- b. The parenthesis 2:14-7:4 speaks of a special ministry (of the new covenant, of the Spirit, of righteousness, of reconciliation and of the word) that is, in its essential characteristics, different from the ministry to the saints(8-9).

In Second Corinthians διακονία (ministry, service) is not used indiscriminately. As in every instance where διακονία is used in the New Testament, its referent has to be identified carefully,⁵ for there are different kinds of

διακονία (Romans 12:4ff) and different kinds of διάκονοι (ministers or servants).

i) In 2:14-7:4 διακονία is always related to “spiritual concerns,” that is, conversion, salvation, condemnation. (Paul is one of the servants through whom the Corinthians had come to the faith [διάκονοι δι’ ὧν ἐπίστεύσατε, 1 Cor. 3:5]).

ii) In 8-9 διακονία deals with the collection being taken to help the needy in Jerusalem (διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους).

iii) In 10-13 Paul’s διακονία is the preaching of the gospel (11:7) of God. In this service Paul, in contradistinction to the false apostles who are ministers of Satan (διάκονοι αὐτοῦ [Σατανᾶς] 11:14, 15), is a minister of righteousness (διάκονος δικαιοσύνης, 11:15). Not all ministers are servants of the Gospel or of God, and not all ministries are services of the ministry of the word or reconciliation. For that reason, apparently, Paul comments on the signs that point to the ministers of Christ (11:23) and to the apostles of Christ (12:13).

The distinctions that Paul makes concerning διακονία may be summarized as follows: The διακονία of the judaizers⁶ has nothing to do with the διακονία that is a service to Christ, for their service is to Satan and they are false apostles (11:14-15). The Corinthians’ διακονία to the saints who are in Jerusalem (9:1) is a noble and good service. This service brings glory to God for it is a proof of obedience to the gospel (9:13). But it is quite different from the service that Paul speaks about in 2:14-7:4. About the διακονία of chapters 8-9 Paul gives advice and not a command (8:8, 10). One can scarcely imagine Paul saying the same about the διακονία of 2:14-7:4 when he has already, approximating the severe tone of Galatians, said that those who oppose it are hard hearted (hard minded, 3:14) and that the followers of the opposition are darkness, are unbelievers and have part with Belial (6:14,15), for this διακονία is the service that Paul goes to great pains to uphold and defend. This is the service to which he has given his life. It is not man’s service in any way but God’s service to men. It is for that reason that such a careful distinction must be maintained in defining διακονία. Ultimately it is a matter of distinguishing between the law and the Gospel, between justification and sanctification. It is the διακονία that Paul defends in 2:14-7:4 that gives life to the sinner, and subsequently life to the church, and which makes all things new. It is the service which is distinguishable from all other services because it is the ministry that is indispensable to the life of the church while all others, important and God pleasing as they may be, are occasional.

c. The parenthesis 2:14-7:4 is Paul's description and defense of one διακονία, the church's one gospel διακονία.

i. *It is a ministry of the new covenant (3:6-4:6)*

Paul and his co-workers — Silvanus, Timothy and Titus are mentioned by name (1:1; 1:19; 2:13; 12:18) — are ministers of the new covenant (διακόνους καινῆς διαθήκης). Their ministry is a ministry of the Spirit (διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος, 3:8) for it is through the Spirit that the ministry of righteousness or justification (διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης, 3:9) is carried out in the name of the Lord (1 Cor. 6:11).

Paul clearly contrasts his διακονία to that of the judaizing false apostles when he points out that theirs is a ministry of death (διακονία τοῦ θανάτου, 3:7) and a ministry of judgment or condemnation (διακονία τῆς κατακρίσεως, 3:9). Their ministry is such because they fail to see Christ as the purpose and fulfillment of the Sinaitic law (3:14-18), and they affirm another “gospel,” most probably, as the language of 11:4 suggests, a “gospel” which, to a greater or lesser degree, makes justification dependent on the law (Gal. 5:4). The old covenant (παλαιά διαθήκη) and its purpose is veiled to them (3:14-17) so that in their hardness of heart they even attack the ministers of that new covenant which they knew would one day come (Jeremiah 31:31-34).

Paul repudiates what could be called a Sinaitic ministry in so far as it attempts to become a ministry of righteousness and justification, for it is precisely in attempting to become such that it becomes a ministry of death and judgment. Elsewhere Paul clarifies the relation between the Sinaitic law and the gospel of Christ. The thrust (*opus proprium*) of Paul's ministry is to serve as a minister of the Gospel or a minister of justification.⁷ His work with the law, necessary as it is, is a foreign work (*opus alienum*) as he makes clear in Galatians 3:19-22 and Romans 7:7-12.

ii. *It is a ministry carried on by earthen vessels (4:7-5:11)*

Paul has this ministry (τὴν διακονίαν ταύτην), and therefore he does not despair or lose heart (4:1). The treasure (this ministry and all its riches) is held in earthen vessels (4:7). One would expect magnificent and impressive speakers and doers as the servants (δούλους) of this ministry. But, the reality is different. Paul preaches Jesus but for his sake is always delivered up to death so that Christ may be manifested in his mortal flesh (4:11). His ministry does bring renewal to the inward man (4:16), but it doesn't stop the present decay of the outward man. But he doesn't, for all that, desire to die and be

done with it all, but rather desires to be further clothed with the resurrection body (5:5). Until then, he walks by faith, not by sight (5:7). At the judgment seat of Christ the now hidden reality of things will be seen, and it will become clear who is well pleasing to the Lord: those who make a good impression, who glory in appearance but not in heart (5:12) and who oppose his ministry (τὴν διακονίαν ταύτην), or those who are on the side of his ministry (6:14). Paul knows the answer and so do those who understand the character of his ministry (5:11).

iii. *It is a ministry of reconciliation* (5:12-5:21)

The ministry that concerns Paul is the ministry of reconciliation (τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς — 5:18). This and the ministry of the new covenant are the same. This is a ministry that has to do with the removal of sin and the application of righteousness (5:21). It is a ministry that is dedicated to exhorting others with respect to the things of God, namely, that each man be reconciled to God (6:1). That is what concerns it. The ministry to the saints (8:9) and ministries similar to it (done, as they are, to the glory of God, by his command, out of faith and out of love, and vital in missions as they may be) are distinct from τὴν διακονίαν ταύτην (4:1) of which Paul speaks so highly and at such great length.

iv. *It is God's ministry.*

God's way of reconciling the world to himself is through the work of Christ (5:16-21). However, reconciliation is communicated through the Word (5:19)⁸. Therefore, this ministry (τὴν διακονίαν ταύτην, 4:1) is God's ministry. It is Paul's ministry (διακονίαν ἡμῶν, 6:3)⁹ inasmuch as he is the human agent through whom God does the serving. It is, however, God's service to men, and should be regarded as such by those who receive its benefits, because it is God who pleads through it, "be reconciled" to God (5:20, 6:30). Paul is always a servant/slave (δοῦλος) of God and Christ. He is a servant/slave of the Corinthians because Christ has appointed him as such (δοῦλος ὑμῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦν, 4:5). This ministry, however, is God's ministry, and Paul, above all things, is a servant of Christ (Χριστοῦ, 11:23), and always presents himself as a minister of God (ὡς θεοῦ διάκονοι, 6:4).

v. *It is a distressed ministry* (6:4-10)

The opponents of Paul's ministry look upon him in the same way Paul formerly looked upon Jesus, as one accursed by God. All the difficulties of his ministry are put forward as proof that his ministry is invalid, that is, not of God (6:4-10). But, all these things, on the contrary, demonstrate that Paul is

a true minister of Christ (11:23-33), who makes many rich (6:10), not with a ministry to the body, but with a ministry of righteousness and reconciliation.

vi. *It is a ministry that demands undivided allegiance* (6:11-7:4).

The Corinthians were being enticed to follow after the false prophets, the ministers of the devil (11:13-15). These are those who opposed the central thrust of Paul's apostolic ministry — justification and reconciliation. Even though they may claim allegiance to Christ, their allegiance to the ministry of death and condemnation make them unbelievers, darkness, participants with Belial and idolaters (6:14-18). Identification with and allegiance to the true servants of Christ is of vital importance (6:11 - 7:2).

2. *Second Corinthians 5:16-21*

In Second Corinthians 4:18 Paul has picked up the theme of “things seen and things not seen.” “We walk by faith and not by sight” (5:7) is a variation on that theme. The theme is brought in to the section concerning the false apostles who are “deceitful workers, transforming themselves in to apostles of Christ” (11:13). This deceit in matters of appearance comes from the devil, for he “himself transforms himself into an angel of light” (11:14). But, even before bringing it that far, Paul has picked up this theme again in 5:12 in a reference to the false apostles who “glory in appearance and not in heart” (5:12).

Our pericope commences with a further variation on the “seen, not seen” theme that Paul carries on from 5:12 as the appearance versus truth theme.

16 *Therefore, from now on, we regard no one according to the flesh. Even though we have known Christ according to the flesh, yet now we know Him thus no longer. 17 Therefore, if anyone is in Christ, he is a new creation; old things have passed away; behold, all things have become new.*

Oecolampadius abused this passage by using it to support the Zwinglian thesis that in the Sacrament the eating is only a spiritual eating.¹⁰ Bultmann abused this passage by contending that it obligates the interpreter to distinguish between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith.¹¹ “According to the flesh” (κατὰ σάρκα) is here to be understood as “the external or outward side of life, as it appears to the eye of an unregenerate person.”¹² Paul began by knowing Christ κατὰ σάρκα. He was, in Saul's view, a defiler of the law who had shown contempt for the law and had taught his disciples to do the same.¹³ The way in which Jesus died was a sufficient indication for Saul that Jesus was accursed of God. As Paul would later point out in keeping with

Deuteronomy 21:22,23 (Galatians 3:13, 14), “Cursed is the man who hangs on a tree.” Saul viewed Jesus, then, as a defiler of the law who received exactly what God had decreed concerning blasphemers and false prophets¹⁴ and who had received the just sentence for his blasphemy. In this sense he knew (οἶδομεν) Christ according to the flesh.

All of this changed when Jesus revealed himself to Saul on the road to Damascus. Jesus was the Lord. He was alive. He was not accursed. So, Saul’s view of the externals had to be completely revised. Jesus was indeed the accursed one, but he was accursed not for his sins but for the sins of others: (“One died for all....,” 5:14). Paul had learned to look not on the surface of things but on the reality which was now very clear to him. He no longer knew Christ according to the flesh.

Second Corinthians 5:16, together with 5:14, provide a neat summary of Isaiah 53:1-5, and these verses from Isaiah, in turn, provide a gloss on those two verses from Second Corinthians:

1 He has no form or comeliness; and when we see Him, there is no beauty that we should desire Him. ... 3 He is despised and rejected by men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. And we hid, as it were, our faces from Him; He was despised and we did not esteem Him. 4 Surely He has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows; yet we esteemed Him stricken, smitten by God, and afflicted. 5 But He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement for our peace was upon Him, and by His stripes we are healed.

Paul’s new way of looking at Jesus, a way that is taught by the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 12:3), is characteristic of all believers. This way of viewing Christ extends as well to the way in which one views others. Although it comes first in verse 16, it is the conclusion: “Therefore, from now on, we regard no one according to the flesh.” While the new view concerning Jesus results in the confession concerning Christ as Lord (κύριος, ἰησοῦς) and Savior, the new view concerning others is that “all have died,” their sins have been paid for, it is as if they had already received “the things done in the body, according to what they have done” (5:10). They are the saints (1:1), even though it hardly appears that way (1 Cor. 1:26ff and 6:9-11). This is not something that is seen according to the flesh (κατὰ σάρκα); it is apparent to faith but not to sight (διὰ πίστεως ... ὄυ διὰ εἶδους, 5:7).

In order to make a further elaboration concerning this new way of looking at things Paul employs language related to the creation of the world, lan-

guage that he had already used in 4:6.¹⁵ What God has done in redemption is no less a wonder and miracle than what he did at the creation of the world. Out of people who had no commendable past nor a notable present (1 Cor. 1:26ff and 6:9-11), that is *ex nihilo*, God has made a new creation. The old or former creation (ἀρχαῖα) which was under the wrath of God (Romans 1:18; 8:20) has to give way to the new creation (καινὴ κτίσις). The new creation has been effected through the death of Christ.¹⁶ The former conduct and the old man have to be put off continually, and the new man put on (Eph 4:22, 24),¹⁷ but the man who is in Christ (εἶ τις ἐν Χριστῷ), and only the one who is in Christ, is already (γέγονεν) a new creation even though that newness is not yet apparent to the eye. The eschatological expectation of the full, visible realization of the new creation was voiced already by Paul in the first verses of this chapter (5:1-8; see also Romans 8:22-25).

The new way of looking at Jesus and at the Christians, at Corinth and elsewhere, also has implications for Paul's ministry. Paul desires that his ministry be regarded as God's ministry and, therefore, as one that has an importance which, while it is not seen, is very real and great, one in which even those Christians who do not have that ministry can glory (5:12). The Corinthians are confronted by false apostles who present an exceedingly appealing and enticing appearance, but these Christians are also to act as Paul and his co-workers who "regard no one according to the flesh."

The false apostles who made their appearance in the church of Corinth seem to be judaizers. While they are Christians in that they believe that Jesus was the Christ, their view of Jesus was so far removed from that of Paul. Paul implicitly accuses them of preaching another Christ, another gospel (11:4). They have apparently maintained that life could be found through the Law (3:7-17). For that reason Paul's exposition concerning the basis of the new creation has to be expanded and the all sufficient character of Christ's work amplified.

18 *Now all things are of God, who has reconciled us to Himself through Jesus Christ, and has given us the ministry of reconciliation, 19 that is, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, not imputing their trespasses to them, and has committed to us the word of reconciliation. 20 Therefore we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God were pleading through us: we implore you on Christ's behalf, be reconciled to God. 21 For He made Him who knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him.*

Just as the creation of the world *ex nihilo* could only be an act of God alone, so also the new creation can only be an act of divine monergism: "... all things are of God" (τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ). The manner in which all things in the world were created is described in Genesis. The manner in which the new creation came into being is described in verses 18-21 of our pericope.

The new creation has come into being through God's act of reconciling (καταλλάσσω) the world to himself. To begin with two things should be noted about the word καταλλάσσω: 1) Paul can use καταλλάσσω in the context of reconciliation between husband and wife who have been estranged (1 Cor. 7:11) and in the context of reconciliation between human enemies (Eph. 2:16 [ἀποκαταλλάσσω]; compare Acts 12:22 D).¹⁸ The presupposition of Paul's use of the language of reconciliation in the present verses is the enmity (a state of being enemies) between God and man, the offender, man, having incurred the wrath of a holy God. The enmity between God and man to which Ephesians 2:14-18 and Colossians 1:19-22 witness was also spelled out quite clearly in Isaiah (e.g. 59:1). 2) Καταλλάσσω, without reference to its etymology, implies some kind of change. The change indicated is not a change in God nor a change in man. The change is a change in the status between God and man.¹⁹ Romans 3:25,26 emphasizes that there was no change in God; Romans 5:6-11 emphasizes that there was no change in man. The change of status is, as is apparent in our pericope, ἐν Χριστῷ.

Verses 18-21 at first appear to be a repetitive mixing of two different matters, reconciliation and ministry. The structure that Paul employs here, however, is a purposeful one that has a parallel in Romans 7:16-25, and is a quite effective medium for building up to a triumphant conclusion that puts an intense focus on the matter that is at the center of Paul's attention. Verse 18 states the basic theme:

Now all things are of God, who has reconciled us to Himself through Jesus Christ, and has given us the ministry of reconciliation,

God has restored peace between fallen man and himself. The means by which this has been done is Jesus Christ. He has put into the charge of men²⁰ the matters concerned with this reconciliation so that they may administer them.

This general statement of the theme is then repeated with clarification and additions:

that is, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, not

imputing their trespasses to them, and has committed to us the word of reconciliation.

In Christ (ἐν Χριστῷ) is a major theme of the New Testament. It has already been seen in verse 17. Here the thought is that without Christ (χωρίς Χριστοῦ, Eph. 2:12) there is no reconciliation and no hope. The manner in which this reconciliation was effected was that God did not count (μὴ λογιζόμενος) the sins (τὰ παραπτώματα) of the sinners against them, something he could have done with all justice. Reconciliation involved a non-imputation of sins as Paul elsewhere makes clear (Rom. 4:8; Ps. 32:2).

The “us” (ἡμᾶς) of verse 18 is clarified here with the word world (κόσμον). The benefits of the reconciliation in Christ are for and extended to the whole world: “One died for all...” (*gratia universalis*). Although Paul speaks of the whole creation as beneficiaries of Christ’s redemption (Rom. 8), here κόσμον, in light of the non-imputation of sin, refers only to human kind. Just as the whole world of men has been included in sin, so also has the whole world been included in justification (Rom 3:23,24) and reconciliation (objective justification or reconciliation), so that each and everyone who believes receives the present and future benefits of justification and reconciliation (subjective justification or reconciliation).²¹

The ministry of reconciliation that was introduced in verse 18 is now clarified as to its matter and medium: the word (λόγον) of reconciliation. Λόγος here is synonymous with gospel (Eph. 1:13)²². The word is a report or message about the cross (1 Cor. 1:18) and it is the truth (Col. 1:5). The word carries the creative power of God (2 Cor. 4:6) so that it is more than a report but also a power of God for salvation (1 Cor. 1:18; see also Rom. 1:16,17). The ministry of reconciliation then is a specific service, one that has as its center and focus the word of reconciliation.

Therefore we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God were pleading through us: we implore you on Christ’s behalf, be reconciled to God. For He made Him who knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him.

Verses 20 and 21 should be viewed as a unit. In this unit the theme presented in 18 and elaborated in 19 appears again, with its two elements inverted and then clarified and amplified even further.

a. *The ministry of reconciliation*

The ministry of reconciliation which has as its matter the word of reconciliation is now said to have the character of an embassy. Paul and his co-

workers serve as ambassadors (πρεσβεύομεν). Πρεσβεύειν in one of its denotations²³ points to an authoritative delegation. Paul's own commentary on the word appears in the same sentence. As an ambassador of God and Christ,²⁴ Paul speaks and pleads as though God himself were speaking and pleading (ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος δι' ἡμῶν).²⁵ The phrase "on Christ's behalf" (ὕπὲρ Χριστοῦ) in the second half of the sentence makes the representative character of the ministry of reconciliation even clearer. Paul and his co-workers who labor in the ministry of reconciliation are representatives of God and Christ before the people of Corinth. The exalted character of this ministry does not reside in the person of the ministers. What is important is that the embassy has been conferred on the representative. That the situation of the ambassador does not add to or subtract from the authority²⁶ of the embassy is clear from also in Ephesians 6:20 where Paul points to the irony that he is an ambassador in chains (πρεσβεύω ἐν ἀλύσει).

As it is used by Paul πρεσβεύειν serves as a parallel expression to ἀπόστολος, a title that he holds in very high esteem. Both πρεσβεύειν and ἀπόστολος express the representative character of the ministry of reconciliation, that is to say that Paul and his co-workers represent God and Christ before men so that men may receive, through the agency of men, the forgiveness that God desires to give them.²⁷ That this authoritative representation through the ministry and word of reconciliation will continue throughout the world and until the end of time is presupposed in every form of the commission that Christ gave to his church (Matthew 28:18-20; Luke 24:46-47; Mark 16:14-20; Luke 24:44-49; Acts 1:4-8).²⁸

Another character of the ministry of reconciliation is noted by Paul in verse 19. The ministry of reconciliation is an imploring, beseeching, pleading ministry (παρακαλοῦντος; δεόμεθα). Its purpose is to earnestly proclaim the word of reconciliation so that the hearer will take it to heart.²⁹ Every other work is auxiliary to that.

By giving Paul and his co-workers the ministry of reconciliation and the word of reconciliation God does not thereby vacate his position, Christ does not make himself absent. The ministry of reconciliation is God's ministry, God's service, to men. God is the one who does the imploring, but he does it through men, or as Paul says, "through us" (δι' ἡμῶν).

b. *The basis of the reconciliation*

The basis of reconciliation which was before pointed to as being through Christ (διὰ Χριστοῦ) and in Christ (ἐν Χριστῷ) is now put forward at the

end as the crowning point of the pericope because it is that which gives the ministry of reconciliation its significance:

He made Him who knew no sin to be sin for us
 τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν.
that we might become the righteousness of God in Him
 ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ

God is the subject of the verb ἐποίησεν, for θεός is the nearest possible subject in the text, and, as has already been made clear in verse 18, all (πάντα) things related to reconciliation are from God. In addition, it is clear from the parallel arrangement of the section that Χριστός is the referent of the participial phrase μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν. There could, of course, be no other referent since the New Testament knows of only one sinless human being, Jesus, who is declared to be such by the testimony of the Father (Matt. 3:17), his own testimony (John 8:46) and the testimony of the apostles (1 Peter 2:21,22; Heb. 4:15).

The chiasmic arrangement of the sentence helps to define some of the terms. Sin (ἁμαρτίαν), in the first instance in which it is found in the sentence, is the transgression of the law which itself is revealed by the law (Rm. 3:20). Because of Adam sin is imputed to all (Rm. 5:12-14). There is one who had no involvement with sin in himself (τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν), either by inherited guilt or by inherited corruption. This one, Christ, was made to be sin. Sin here also refers to transgression of the law although it may secondarily allude to a sin offering along the lines of Isaiah 53:10.³⁰ Righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) in the chiasmus is not knowing sin (μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν).

With this definition of terms the scene for the exchange of sin and righteousness is set. What man was, that is one who knew sin, Christ was made to be (ἐποίησεν) that is sin (ἁμαρτίαν). Christ is sin by imputation, or as Isaiah 53:6 expresses it: "the LORD has laid on Him the iniquity of us all." What Christ was, righteousness (δικαιοσύνη, *c.f.* 1 Cor. 1:30), man becomes (γενώμεθα), that is, righteousness. Christ is man's representative before God and stands as his substitute (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν). In Christ the "happy exchange" (*fröhliche Wechseln*) takes place. In order to reconcile the world to himself God did not impute the sin of man to man (μὴ λογίζεσθαι) but to Christ (ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν) so that he would die for (ὑπὲρ) it; righteousness (δικαιοσύνη, a not knowing sin) was imputed to mankind.

The substitutionary base for reconciliation was introduced in verse 14 already where the preposition ὑπὲρ was employed. In that verse ὑπὲρ can-

not be understood except as “in the place of” for in Christ’s death it was as if all had died (εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον) The significance of Jesus’ death is not that he was a religious or political martyr, or an example but that he was an offering for sin (c.f. Lev. 4:21), the substitute for sinners. Again, Isaiah 53 and the whole sacrificial system of the Old Testament stand as a backdrop here.

Reconciliation and justification belong together. Because God has declared the sinner righteous, the grounds have been established for reconciliation. Reconciliation doesn’t come about by God’s wishing or by the omnipotence of God. Justification and reconciliation come about always and only ἐν Χριστῷ, because of Christ’s life and death (ὑπὲρ πάντων). The relationship between justification and reconciliation is spelled out in Romans 5:1ff where reconciliation is seen, along the lines of Ephesians 2, as the restoration of peace between two enemies. As is clear from our pericope and from Romans 5:1-11, justification and reconciliation are intimately connected, with justification being the basis of reconciliation.

1 Therefore, having been justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ 2 through whom also we have access by faith into this grace in which we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. ... 10 For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more, having been reconciled, we shall be saved by His life.

c. Reconciliation and the ministry of reconciliation

In our pericope reconciliation and the ministry of reconciliation are intimately united. The God who effected the reconciliation of the world to himself is the same one who established the ministry of reconciliation.

Now all things are of God, who

τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ

has reconciled us to Himself through Jesus Christ, and

καταλλάξαντος ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ διὰ Χριστοῦ καὶ

has given us the ministry of reconciliation,

δόντος ἡμῖν τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς

There is never any question of having reconciliation without the ministry of reconciliation, the word of reconciliation or the imploring by the ministers of reconciliation. καταλλάξαντος ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ διὰ Χριστοῦ καὶ and δόντος ἡμῖν τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς are parallel expressions. While the establishment of the reconciliation might be logically prior to the establish-

ment of the ministry of reconciliation, the two are never separate. The winning of salvation and the distributing of salvation are never separate in God's economy. Luther expresses this quite clearly:

... We treat of the forgiveness of sins in two ways. First, how it is achieved and won. Second, how it is distributed and given to us. Christ has achieved it on the cross, it is true. But he has not distributed or given it on the cross. He has not won it in the supper or sacrament. There he has distributed and given it through the Word, as also in the gospel, where it is preached. He has won it once for all on the cross. But the distribution takes place continuously, before and after, from the beginning to the end of the world. ...

If now I seek the forgiveness of sins, I do not run to the cross, for I will not find it given there. Nor must I hold to the suffering of Christ, as Dr. Karlstadt trifles, in knowledge or remembrance, for I will not find it there either. But I will find in the sacrament or gospel the word which distributes, presents, offers and gives to me that forgiveness which was won on the cross. (LW 40:213, 214)

That all people should be directed to the ministry and word of reconciliation is the testimony of the Lutheran Confessions:

Now, God does not call without means but through the Word, as indeed he has commanded the preaching of repentance and forgiveness of sin. St. Paul testified to the same effect when he wrote, "We are ambassadors in Christ's stead, and God is admonishing you through us, 'Be reconciled to God'" (II Cor. 5:20). [SD XI, 27, Election]

That the ministers represent Christ in the ministry of both word and sacrament is also the testimony of the our Confessions:

Thus it squares with our position that a minister who consecrates shows forth the body and the blood of the Lord to the people, just as a minister who preaches shows forth the gospel to the people, as Paul says (1 Cor. 4:1), "This is how one should regard us, as ministers of Christ and dispensers of the sacraments of God," that is, of the Word and sacraments; and II Cor. 5:20, "We are ambassadors for Christ, God making his appeal through us. We beseech you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God." (Apology XXIV, 80, The Mass)

3. *A Conclusion by Way of the Introduction*

After the opening salutation of his letters Paul usually includes a paragraph of blessing or thanksgiving. These paragraphs normally foreshadow

some major theme of the letter.³¹ The opening blessing of our Second Corinthians refers to comfort:

Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies and God of all comfort, who comforts us in all our tribulation, that we may be able to comfort those who are in any trouble, with the comfort with which we ourselves are comforted by God. (1:3-4)

What comfort is to be found in Second Corinthians? The great comfort of this letter has to do with the ministry of reconciliation. When this ministry was impugned distress came to Paul because of the great damage that the Corinthians would inevitably suffer because of its diminution or loss. But the excellence of this ministry is what keeps Paul from losing heart in the face of so many obstacles, obstacles put before him by those from without (the false apostles) and those from within (the Corinthians who are quick to follow the false apostles). The ministry of reconciliation is a comfort and encouragement to Paul:

“Therefore since we have this ministry as we have received mercy, we do not lose heart.”

The ministry of reconciliation is also a comfort to the Corinthians. While the ministry of reconciliation may not appear to be much, the Corinthians, once they learn to understand and appreciate it anew, can glory in it in spite of its veiled and humble outward appearance. When others toss the glory of a false and diabolic ministry in the face of the Corinthians, the Corinthians can find comfort in the fact that God has already given to his church the ministry of reconciliation, one that is administered by Paul, his co-workers and their successors, so that through it they can find the certainty of their reconciliation and glory in it:

For we do not commend ourselves again to you, but give you opportunity to glory on our behalf, that you may have something to answer those who glory in appearance and not in heart.” (5:12)

While it may seem boastful to shine too bright a light on the excellency of the ministry, to do so may, on the contrary, be just what the beleaguered minister of reconciliation needs today:

Paul ... set[s] forth his calling, his ministry, and his Gospel. ... But what does [he] intend by this bragging? I reply: This doctrine has as its purpose that every minister of the Word of God should be sure of his calling. In the sight of both God and man he should boldly glory that he preaches the Gospel as one who has been called and sent. Thus the

king's emissary boasts and glories that he does not come as a private person but as the emissary of the king. Because of this dignity as the king's emissary he is honored and given the position of highest honor, which he would never receive if he were to come as a private person. Therefore let the preacher of the Gospel be sure that his calling is from God. It is perfectly proper that he should follow Paul's example and exalt this calling of his, so that he may gain credence and authority among the people. In the same way the king's emissary elevates his office and calling. To glory this way is not vain but necessary; for he does not glory in himself but in the king who has sent him and who authority he seeks to have honored and elevated. When, in the name of the king, he wants something to be done by his subjects, he does not say, "We request," but, "We command, we want this to be done." But as a private person he says, "We request."

In the same way, when Paul commends his calling so highly, he is not arrogantly seeking his own praise, as some people suppose; he is elevating his ministry with a necessary and a holy pride. Thus he says also to the Romans (11:13): "Inasmuch as I am an apostle to the Gentiles, I magnify my ministry." That is to say: "I want men to receive me, not as Paul of Tarsus but as Paul the apostle or ambassador of Jesus Christ." He has to do this to maintain his authority, so that those who hear this may be more attentive and more willing to listen to him. For they are not listening to Paul; but in Paul they are listening to Christ Himself and to God the Father, who sends him forth. Just as men should devoutly honor the authority and majesty of God, so they should reverently receive and listen to His messengers, who bring His Word.³²

May the church and her ministers boast properly of her ministry: The ministers, that their service is a divinely instituted one that pleases God and that they are fellow workers for the joy of the saints; the church, that the Word of reconciliation is not far off but ready at hand in the ministry of reconciliation.

Soli Deo Gloria

End Notes

- ¹ Lutherans give testimony to the intimate relation between reconciliation and justification and the ministry of the church when, for example, in the Augsburg Confession, Article IV (Justification) and Article V (The Ministry of the Church) are juxtaposed and verbally tied together. The relation of these two articles to one another also emphasizes the evangelical source and purpose of the church's ministry: IV.we receive forgiveness of sin and become righteous before God by grace, for Christ's sake, through faith, when we believe that Christ suffered for us and that for his sake our sin is forgiven and righteousness and eternal life are given to us. For God will regard and reckon this faith as righteousness..... V. To obtain such faith God instituted the office of the ministry, that is, provided the Gospel and the sacraments. Through these, as through means, he gives the Holy Spirit, who works faith ... (*The Book Of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, trans. and ed. by Theodore G. Tappert, Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1959).
- ² Underlining indicates a textual variant.
- ³ This threefold division of Second Corinthians, not necessarily with the same content analysis, is generally recognized by commentators. Some students of Second Corinthians see these sections as subdivisions of one letter (Jeremias, Hughes, Barrett, Kümmel). Others assert that they are portions of other letters, presumably written by Paul, which were edited to form the present Second Corinthians (Kruse, Furnish [*Anchor Bible*], J.G. Anderson [*A New Accurate Translation of the Greek New Testament*, Naples, Florida, 1984 and 1989, p. 823]). The Christian church knows nothing of a letter of Paul other than that which she has in its present form, with minor textual variants. Any editorial work that might have done by Paul or by his associates is conjectural and based on considerations of a literary character without any hard textual evidence.
- ⁴ Philip Edcumbe Hughes, *Paul's Second Epistle To the Corinthians: The English Text With Introduction And Notes*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1962, p. xx. Two reasons for considering 2:14 - 7:4 to be a parenthesis are the following: 1) The center of Paul's attention in 2:13, Titus, changes, and is picked up again in 7:4. 7:4 could naturally follow 2:13. 2) Paul has one theme in 2:14 - 7:4 i.e., the ministry. The entrance into and the exit from the parenthesis are not entirely lacking in logic. The entrance — Paul goes to Macedonia in seeming defeat (2:13). However, in Christ there is always triumph (2:14). ("Triumph" and "fragrance" belong to a victory parade image.) The question of "who is sufficient" to participate in such a great enterprise leads to the ministry. At the close of the parenthesis Paul anticipates a theme that he will touch upon in chapter 11. He warns of the danger of associating with unbelievers (presumably the judaizing false apostles). He reminds the Corinthians that he has not deceived them. His tribulation has also been an occasion of joy. Then, back to the sorrow occasioned by Titus' absence, sorrow that was turned to joy. The character of the parenthesis is described by Hughes: "At this point there commences an extended digression or "parenthesis" (2:14-7:4) — a digression, that is, as concerns the framework but not at all as concerns the substance of the epistle." (p. xx).
- ⁵ *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, translated and abridged by Geoffrey Bromiley, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985. See also, Bruce Bitter, "What Is Ministry," *Logia: A Journal Of Lutheran Theology*, Vol. III, No. 3, July 1994, p. 23-37, especially Thesis 6.

- ⁶ That Paul's opponents bear the name of Christ but yet preach a different gospel than that of Paul is implicit in 3:7-17 and explicit in 11:4.
- ⁷ The equation between Gospel ministry and ministry of justification is made in Romans 1:16.
- ⁸ "Communicated" is only part of the picture. The Word cleanses (John 15:3) and justifies (Rm. 1:16-17) and therefore is a means of grace.
- ⁹ There is a textual variant here with ἡμῶν omitted in some texts. The NIV translates the ἡμῶν.
- ¹⁰ *LW* 38:46.
- ¹¹ C.K. Barrett, *The Second Epistle To The Corinthians*, Hendrickson: Peabody, 1973, p. 171.
- ¹² (1 Cor. 1:26, 2 Cor. 11:18; see also John 8:15.), *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature: A Translation and adaptation of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*, Fourth edition, William Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. University of Chicago: Chicago, 1957. See also *TDNT*, p. 1004.
- ¹³ Acts 6:13-14.
- ¹⁴ Lev. 24:11, Deut. 18:5.
- ¹⁵ "For it is the God who commanded light to shine out of darkness who has shone in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." The language of the old versus the new is also prominent in Isaiah 42:9, 43:18ff, 51:9ff.
- ¹⁶ In the immediate context Paul refers only to the death of Christ and does not include the resurrection. (Compare with the important parallel text of Romans 5:1-11 where the resurrection is included.)
- ¹⁷ ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφὴν τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον ... ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὀσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας.
- ¹⁸ *TDNT* (p. 40ff)
- ¹⁹ *Ministers of the Gospel: A Commentary on Second Corinthians*, J.P. Meyer, Northwestern: Milwaukee, 1963, p. 103. *TDNT*, p. 41. See also Franz Pieper, *Christian Dogmatics*, Vol. 2, Concordia: St. Louis, p. 347.
- ²⁰ What is the referent of the first person plural pronouns, ἡμῶν, ἡμῖν, ἡμᾶς, that is, to whom has the ministry of reconciliation been given? There is a very interesting and important interplay of pronouns in this section (as elsewhere in Paul's writings.). These pronouns can and do sometimes refer to the reconciled, sometimes to the Corinthians, sometimes to Paul and his co-workers. The ministry of reconciliation, which is basically the same as the forgiveness of sins, is given to the whole church (Matthew 18:15-18, esp. v. 17; 1 Cor. 3:3:21-23); in verse 21 Paul and his co-workers are exhorting the Corinthians to be reconciled to God (κατάλλαγητε) and therefore Paul and his co-workers are the referent of the first person pronoun. While the keys have been given to Christ's church in general, oversight (ἐπισκοπή, ἐπίσκοπος) for the flock as been given to certain ones (Acts 20:28; Eph. 4:11ff). There is no contradiction between the fact that all things, including the apostles and their co-workers, belong to the Christians (1 Cor. 3:21-23) and that some have oversight of others (as in

Ephesus and Corinth.). See Meyer, p. 109.

- ²¹ In the letter to the Romans Paul relies on the Old Testament, especially Isaiah, for evidence of his teaching: The extent of God's saving activity in Isaiah is the whole human world. The Lord is the Lord of all; all nations must do his bidding (5:26ff); even the gentiles will benefit from the coming light (9:1,2); the child who is born will govern all (9:6); all will seek the Rod of Jesse (11:10); and so on: 42:2, 49:1-6, 55:1-5, 60:1, 62:1,2; 66:19,20. See Romans 9-11 concerning the Old Testament testimony concerning the extension of the Gospel to the gentiles.
- ²² Some copyists apparently made an effort to insert εὐαγγέλιον in the text. (Nestle-Aland apparatus).
- ²³ Liddell-Scott- cites πρεσβεύω in Herodotus who interestingly enough uses it in connection with Corinth (*A Greek English Lexicon*, with a supplement from 1968, Clarendon Press: Oxford).
- ²⁴ The parallelism here equates God and Christ.
- ²⁵ ὥς is translated "as though," in the NKJV and in the NIV. The "as though" which in some contexts implies unreality is apparently used here used for stylistic reasons. An interesting parallel where ὥς is translated "as" is found in 1 Peter 4:11 where εἴ τις λαλεῖ, ὥς λόγια θεοῦ in no way implies a hypothetical or unreal situation.
- ²⁶ Robert Kolb comments in *The Christian Faith* (p. 280) "Particularly in the democratic societies of the last two centuries debates have arisen about the division of power between church and public ministry, between God's people as a whole and their public leaders. This debate reflects a presupposition that there is only so much power to go around and thus this power must be divided rightly. It ignores the biblical presupposition that power in God's church resides in the Word, not in the priests or the pastors." The question of authority as it is addressed here is concerned with this that the forgiveness of sins, in whatever form it may be found, is an effective forgiveness for it is the authority of God himself ("He who hears you, hears me," Lk. 10:16) who has established the manner in which it is to be dispensed.
- ²⁷ The essence of the authoritative nature of the apostolic office can be grasped in a few paragraphs of K.H. Rengstorff's article on the apostle taken from *TDNT* (p. 69)

The LXX has it (ἀπόστολος) only in 1 Kgs. to describe Ahijah's commission to give a divine message to the king's wife.

...the term salī(a)h ... is recognized, e.g., by Jerome, to bear some kinship to the N.T. ἀπόστολος.

The legal institution of the salū(a)h, which is ancient but takes shape in the first century, involves commissioning with specific tasks and stresses authorization. The legal element of giving and obeying orders is decisive. The person sent represents the sender, e.g., in betrothal, divorce, or purchase. Full adherence to the commission is presupposed. The applicable law is that of the messenger, whose honoring or shaming is an honoring or shaming of the sender (1 Sam. 25:40-41; 2 Sam. 10:1-2). The person sent is as the person who sends.

There is full identity between ἀπόστολος and salī(a)h in Jn. 13:16. where ἀπόστολος denotes the one who is legally charged to represent the person and cause of another.

The rise of the apostolate begins with the first group of disciples. ... Only true disciples

can have this authoritative part in the work of Jesus. Thus all apostles must be disciples, though not all disciples need be apostles.

The disciples begin their apostolic work when Jesus makes them co-workers. ... If the disciples have full power to speak and act as Jesus does, this does not confer rights but implies the duty of service. ... Apostleship as such has no religious character but is just a form. The apostles receive their religious impress from him who commissions them, and in such a way that the commission itself is the main thing, not its bearers.

...ἀπόστολος is simply an objective word to denote a fully accredited representative with a specific commission. The apostleship, then, derives from Jesus .. in terms of authoritative commissioning.

An objective element, the message, thus becomes the content of apostolate. ... The success of the apostles is the success of Jesus himself, and in the report it crowds out any reference to difficulties in the discharge of the task.

The apostles have special significance as leaders who enjoy the full accreditation of the Lord with a universal commission to what is to be a universal community. The Lord is still behind what they say and do. He himself is the subject of their message.

The God who worked through Jesus works through Paul as one who serves God and thus shares in God's own work (1 Cor. 3:8.11ff.) This is true, however, only on the basis of his commission, not his person.

- 28 That the apostolate continues in the church after the time of the first apostles is evident from the situation at Ephesus: Paul passes his charge on to the elders at Ephesus (Acts 20:28ff). The elders and bishops are to do the same work that Paul did. Prophets, apostles, pastors, teachers are equally gifts of the Risen and Ascended Christ to the church and are concerned with the same matters (Eph. 4:11). The readiness with which the Apostles Peter and Paul identified with those who were not numbered among the original apostles but who were their co-workers (1 Cor. 3:5; 1 Peter 5:1; 1 John 1) is significant. In Second Corinthians the transmission of apostolic authority is evident in Timothy and Titus.
- 29 It should be noted here that the hearer is directed to the place where God has determined to meet him, that is, in the ministry of the Word. The ministry of reconciliation was not established as an ornament, but as a ministry through which sinners could, in fact, be reconciled to God. Those who work in the ministry of reconciliation are to proclaim the reconciliation; those who hear the proclamation of the Gospel are to consider it as the manner in which God desires to reconcile men unto himself. The hearers shouldn't look elsewhere for reconciliation. Should they consider some other message, which is not the Gospel, to be the means of reconciliation, then they have heard the true Word of reconciliation in vain and receive no benefit from it. That is what Paul emphasizes in the verses immediately following the present pericope: "We then, as workers together *with Him* also plead with *you* not to receive the grace of God in vain. For he says: *In an acceptable time I have heard you, and in the day of salvation I have helped you*" (6:1-2)
- 30 David Chytraeus, for example. *Chytraeus On Sacrifice*, John Warwick Montgomery, Concordia: St. Louis, 1962, p. 46. Because of its parallelism with righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) in the second part of the sentence sin (ἁμαρτία) would appear to refer to transgression and not sin offering.
- 31 Colin Kruse, *The Second Epistle Of Paul To The Corinthians: An Introduction And Commentary*, Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, p. 60.
- 32 Luther, *AE*, 26:15,16)

Creation

by Walter A. Maier, Ph. D.

• Reprinted from Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh Convention of the Iowa District, Synod of Missouri, Ohio and Other States. Assembled at Keystone, IA Aug. 20-24, 1934.

I. The Sources

The approach to the study of the creation of our universe and more particularly to the record of the beginning of our world and the origin of all life and human existence brings the Christian investigator before a great holy of holies, to the sacred precincts of God's first revelation, where an inner voice commands in reverent awe: "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet; for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." In surveying the first page of the Bible, this simple, unpretentious but majestic overture to the genesis of all existence and history, the contemplation of faith uncovers an immeasurable magnificence of divine power, an unfathomable profundity of divine wisdom and an overwhelming evidence of divine love in the founding and equipment of this world as the habitation of man. And because of the startling splendor of this revelation those who have seen God the Creator with eyes of illumined faith and would sing an anthem of praise to His glory are constrained to cry out with the prophet of old: "Woe unto me! . . . for I am a man of unclean lips!" —so gripping, so intense are the personal impulses that should arise within the hearts of God's children every time they prepare to behold the mysterious and miraculous unfolding of history's origin. Let our modern world, saturated with its materialistic philosophies, try to reduce these creative accounts to physical equations or to geologic classifications; let irreverence revel in its sarcasm and heap its insinuations on the biblical narrative and the implications involved in this scriptural doctrine of creation; let the agnostic shrug his shoulder with careless indifference, the atheist thunder out his blasphemies; we raise our hearts at the very beginning of this study on beginnings to thank our heavenly Father, the Creator of all, for the enlightenment that has come to us through His holy and perfect Word. We ask that our hearts may respond to the appeal of the Spirit for interest, sincerity and devotion, as we prepare to unveil, as far as the limitations of our human senses permit, the

evidence of God's omnipotence, omniscience and all-embracing love in the creation.

Unfortunately we do not always feel the thrill that should surge through us when we pause to remind ourselves that it has been given to us to know that which human reason, of itself, can never know, to understand that which intellectual processes and scientific research, unaided by the divine record, can never comprehend. For there is one, and only one, source of absolute and final verity in the study of cosmic and human origins that is found in the opening chapters of Genesis as well as in the parallel and sometimes supplementary passages on creation that mark the subsequent Scriptures. Though men invent superpowered telescopes that sweep the starry heavens and bring the moon within an astronomical distance of twenty-five miles; though they delve into the minutiae of the universe and occupy themselves with the study of the component parts of the atoms, they will never—in chemical laboratories, in physical research, in biological experiment, in anthropological theorization, in geologic survey, in astronomical discovery, in botanical investigation to be able to rise and all human experiences from this absolute beginning of the creation and existence of man.

True, scientists may conclude that from the remarkable progress of their studies that God created the world, for this *a posteriori* knowledge is recognized in Rom. 1, 20, where the natural knowledge of God, that rises from an unbiased acceptance of ordinary sense evidence, is acknowledged in this statement: "The invisible things of Him [God] *from the creation of the world* are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead." None but the wilfully blind who discard the testimony of their own intelligence and the verdict of their senses can deny that there must be a Creator behind the creature, a divine superintelligence behind the order, system, precision of the planetary movements, an omnipotent Designer behind the marvelous complexities of design in the animate and inanimate world.

But while all true natural sciences are concerned with the demonstrations of natural laws they can only speculate on any issues that lie above and beyond these laws. And since there can be no *a priori* knowledge of the creation in man's own experience, he can never employ either empirical or speculative science to reveal the circumstances and processes of creation. Those world-shaping, universe-moulding, creative acts that answered the fiat of the heavenly Creator were unseen by human eyes, unheard by mortal ears; and if there are to be any accurate pictures of these initial stages in cosmic

history they must be drawn, not in the overconfident line of caricature, in which modern science often lavishly indulges, but by the Hand of God Himself in His own revelation.

The Church has never protested against the speculative efforts of modern science in the effort to learn more about the beginning of all beginnings. As long as the results are merely hypothetical, the processes experimental, and the whole effort restricted by the requirements of the Word of God, the Church, far from remaining passive or indifferent, has encouraged the development and the support of pure science. We protest only when the arrogance of human intellectualism vaunts itself over the Word of God; when men try to correct the Scriptures on the basis of field work and laboratory investigation; when atheistic scoffers, sitting in high academic places, rule out the Genesis record as threadbare, antiquated superstition and wilfully try to enlighten the minds of our country's youth with the barrage of pseudoscientific fog.

Let us remember this truism and axiom of our faith that may easily be minimized or compromised at a time when our high school boys and girls bring home textbooks which picture a fiery ball crystallizing, —through millions of years, —out of a stellar nebula into our globe with its cooling crust; or when college sophomores at tax-supported colleges speak glibly and confidently on other antisciptural theories: wherever any scientific account of the origin of the world, or the beginning of life in vegetation, beast or man, conflicts with the Word of God or entirely contradicts it, the truth of the Scripture must remain uncontested in the mind of the Christian, even though the attack which is leveled against its final authority be raised by leaders in present-day scientific thought, Nobel prize winners, heads of departments at heavily endowed universities, brilliant minds of applauded genius. It will, of course, be increasingly difficult for our Church to continue its unashamed acknowledgment of God as Creator at a time in which even pulpits are prostituted into the unabashed denial of His creative omnipotence; but our faith must grow as this opposition increases. And there are these basic considerations which will help to strengthen us in our conviction:

(1) We have the infallible seal of heaven's own truth in our Bible, the perfect, holy, inerrant, literally inspired Word of God, by the truth of which we can challenge:

Hammer away, ye rebel bands!

Your hammers break. God's anvil stands!

(2) Then, there is no degree of unanimity in the scientific ridicule of the scriptural account of creation. What one college textbook affirms the other

denies. The theory which one great physicist advances as an assured result of scientific investigation is just as emphatically repudiated by another physicist of equally recognized authority. American biologists say "Yes," European biologists say "No" to the same basic proposition. And as we think of the scientific assaults on scientific theorization, we are reminded of the words penned by William Blake:

Mock on, mock on, Voltaire, Rousseau!

Mock on, mock on; 'tis all in vain.

You throw the dust against the wind

And the wind blows it back again.

I remind you, by way of illustration, of the diametrically opposed theories that would account for creation and the origin of life, of the mutually contradictory and self-eliminating mass of figures on the age of the world and the chaos of conflict in the process predicated by animal and human evolution.

(3) Finally the vulnerability of these antiscriptural claims is graphically illustrated by their fleeting and ephemeral existence. Theories before which scientists of yesterday as acolytes in the great temple of human advance bowed submissively are today thrown into neglect and discard. We are in the very midst of a scientific revolt against the materialism that has held intellectual thought in its iron grip during our generation; and while I would warn against the hope that the frequently quoted utterances of Jeans and Eddington imply any thought of a scientific right-about-face, back to the Bible, it is conversely true that many scientists have consigned the accepted mechanism and fatalism of our day to the limbo of outmoded theories. It would be interesting to record some of these reversals of professional opinion as they pertain to the doctrine of creation. But many of these have repeatedly been catalogued and chronicled. Suffice it to say that when the Iowa District of the next generation holds its Synodical Convention, there will still be a studied ridicule against the first pages of Genesis; but that ridicule will be based on objections which are altogether different from those that engage our attention today. And in all the kaleidoscopic changes, in all the scientific advances and retreats, the biblical doctrine of creation will then be the same as it is today and as it was yesterday.

Our modern irreverence has worked overtime in its effort to indict and discredit the Genesis record. Volubly has it insisted that these pages contain scientific inaccuracies; that archaeology has demonstrated a mythical substratum on which Biblical creationism is built; that higher criticism has shown the contradictions in the Scriptural narrative. On the charges based on scien-

tific grounds I shall speak briefly in connection with the detailed processes of creation and show that these divine acts have been labelled as unscientific and impossible only because they do not agree with some of the prevalent and favorite theories, though they do agree with the outspoken verdict of eminent men of science and letters who have found no conflict between their secular and their sacred studies.

Turning to the archaeological attacks, we see that the scriptural account of creation has been labeled as a metamorphosed myth emanating from Babylonian records and purifying itself in this transition. But even some of the master minds of high criticism have rebelled at this atrocious caricature of misrepresentation because they know that its exalted monotheism can never have arisen from the ugly conflict of Babylonian polytheism, while we know that every Scripture is God-breathed. The claim, so seriously developed in the Pan-Babylonian school and supported by the meticulous bias of Gunkel, that in the conflict of Marduk, head of the Babylonian pantheon, with Tiamat, dragonlike protagonist of the older gods, and in the splitting of Tiamat into two flat halves from which heaven and earth were made, —that this pagan pollution forms the basis for the Genesis record, is so unnatural and obviously forced that some of the more fair-minded critics have risen up in protest.

The scriptural record has further been assailed as betraying diversified and contradictory sources. It is held that while Gen. 1 to 2, 4a ff. (according to the most prevalent of several critical theories) is a combination of the Jahwistic and the Elohist accounts that originated 300 or 400 years before the first chapter was written. We are then assured the evidence of these diversified sources is seen in the mutually contradictory differences which invalidate either or both of these records. To this we answer that Gen. 2, 4b ff. is not, by its own declaration, an additional account of the creation; it is supplementary and exhibits its character by omitting some of the most essential parts of the creation. It does not tell of the formation of the earth or of the production of the dry land; it does not mention the creation of the firmament nor of the heavenly bodies; it does not record the creation of the marine animals nor does it chronicle the creation of the vegetable world. It simply serves the preliminary purpose of leading up to the tragedy of the Fall of man and for this reason it explains that man consists of body and soul; it shows the relation of Adam to Eve; it places the location of the subsequent temptation scene and emphasizes the large measure of God's providential care in equipping the Garden of Eden. When viewed in this light, all alleged discrepancies be-

tween Chapters I and II (the claim that in Chapter I man's food consists of the fruit of trees and the vegetables, while in Chapter II he is restricted to the fruit; the insistence that in Chapter I the land which has emerged from the water must be moist while in Chapter II rain is required; the charge that Chapter II unlike Chapter I places the creation of man before the creation of the vegetable world; the assertion that Chapter II again changes the order of the creation of man and beast by indication that Adam was created before the animals), these deliberate assaults, which form the stock in trade of atheists and scoffers, eliminate themselves by the ordinary processes of sound and reverent exegesis.

When the attack on the divine truth of creationism has spent its accumulated energies, and when the smoke of battle has subsided, the opening chapters of the Bible to which the later Scriptures offer repeated testimony, even in the words of our Lord and Savior, Matt. 19, 5, it will be found that the truth of Genesis has escaped unscathed. In a world of constantly increasing denial it will be our sacred duty and our unmerited privilege to reiterate our unreserved conviction of the absolute and supreme truth of the Christian doctrine of creation as it has been interpreted and defended throughout the history of our Lutheran Church.

II. The Creator

The entire presentation of creation centers both directly and indirectly about the Creator. In the creation record proper, Gen. 1-2, 4a, the Creator is called Elohim, one of the Old Testament names for God, the second in prominence, occurring 2,570 times. When used of God it is a proper name and is distinguished by its plural form. This plurality is no survival of an original polytheism (as many moderns contend), for it is consistently construed with the singular, and the Scriptures are so emphatic in their exaltation of original monotheism that none but the wilfully blind can discover anything as contradictory to the very essence of the Scriptures as the suggestion of polytheism. It is not simply a plural denoting majesty and rank (Gesenius 124, §), not merely an abstract plural denoting the equivalent to "Deity" (Driver). But it is a plural indicative of the plurality of persons in the one Godhead. The doctrine of the Trinity is an integral teaching of the Old Testament (see especially Pieper, "Dogmatik," Vol. I, 484 ff.) and the truth that the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity were engaged in the creation of the world is indicated by the statements of the first chapter supplemented by many decisive passages from the Old and New Testament.

Thus in the creative record of Genesis we note the expression "Let us make" (v. 26). As will be shown, there is no other interpretation in harmony with the text but that which indicates the plurality of persons in the Trinity. V. 2 mentions the Spirit of God and v. 3 implies the creation by "the word," which in the light of John 1, 3 is a reference to the "Logos," Christ.

In addition to this significant record we have the host of passages which speak of God the Father as the Creator. Then there are passages like the following which stress the Son's creative activity; Col. 1, 16: "For by Him: (Christ) "were all things created." I Cor. 8, 6: "By whom" (Jesus Christ) "are all things." Eph. 3,9: "God who created all things by Jesus Christ." John 1, 3: "All things were made by Him" (the Word). Heb. 1, 2: "By whom" (God's Son) "also He" (God) "made the worlds." Finally, there are passages stressing the creative work of the Holy Spirit. Among these we find: Job 33,4: "The Spirit of God hath made me." Job 26, 13: "By His Spirit He hath garnished the heavens." Ps. 104, 30: "Thou sendest forth Thy Spirit, they are created."

The creation is thus one of the *opera divina ad extra*, one of the works of God that involve this world as their object, as divine preservation, the gathering and the maintenance of the Church, etc. These *opera ad extra*, according to the dogmatical axiom, are *indivisa*, that is, they are common to the Three Persons of the Trinity, because unlike the *opera divine ad intra*, the Scriptures are explicit in referring them to the Three Persons. While the Trinity is thus engaged in the creation, the Apostolic creeds and other confessional statements designate particularly the Father as Creator "by accommodation" and because of the scriptural prominence accorded to the Father in the work of the creation. Dr. Pieper summarizes in "Christliche Dogmatik" (I, 516): "So erkennen wir aus der Schrift ein Doppeltes: 1. Die Schrift eignet die *opera ad extra*, die Schoepfung, die Erloesung und die Heiligung, den einzelnen Personen in sonderheit zu (*opera attributiva sive appropriativa*); 2. die Schrift schreibt dieselben Werke zugleich allen drei Personen zu und laesst sie somit *opera tribus personis communia* bleiben. Sie bleiben aber den drei Personen gemeinsam, weil nach der Schrift jeder der drei Personen das numerisch *eine* gottliche Wesen ganz und ungeteilt zukommt und daher auch den drei Personen 'nach aussen' oder 'gegen die Kreaturen' dieselben Eigenschaften und dieselben Werke der Zahl nach zukommen. So haben wir in der Tatsache, dass die Schrift die *opera ad extra* sowohl den einzelnen Personen besonders zueignet, als auch den drei Personen gemeinsam (*communia*) bleiben laesst, ein weiteres Zeugnis oder, wie Luther es gerne

ausdrueckt, eine weitere 'Offenbarung' der ontologischen oder Wesenstrinitaet."

As antitheses to this conception of God as the Creator we have a long catalog of modern philosophies and religious perversions. The first verse of the Bible eliminates pantheism, the philosophy which implies that the world is an emanation from God and therefore that it is God Himself, since this verse clearly implies that the Creator is distinct from His creations. It rules out polytheism since this verse speaks of one God and of one God only, the unique Deity of the Sacred Scriptures. It contradicts atheism because it forcefully teaches that there is a God and that God created the world. It repudiates agnosticism, the evasive theory which insists that we have no definite information on the creation, as on other matters pertaining to God, since it records divine and definite statements pertaining to God and His creative activity.

Amid scientific, philosophic and religious denials the Christians still confess: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth." While others may know that God is the Creator, since all the world is the signboard that proclaims His greatness, only the Christian knows who God is and how His world was created. Since our God is the Creator, the world is His (Ps. 24, 1) and we are His people. What a compelling thought, particularly in these days, when even in the Church the consciousness of this truth has weakened, to realize that this world about us and we ourselves belong to God, that all that we have and are, in its impressive totality, comes from God and ultimately should return to Him! What a source of spiritual strength to know that when the Church follows the command of Christ's valedictory and goes "into all the world," it goes out into God's world and dominion!

III. The Creation in General

Another distinguishing characteristic of the scriptural doctrine of creation is found in the biblical conception of the creation out of nothing. The Hebrew "bara" has several significant connotations. First of all, it is used almost exclusively of divine activity, a restriction for which there is perhaps no parallel in any other language. Then, it implies the idea of effortless production, especially by word or volition. Moreover, it often has the connotation of producing something new, something which has not previous existence. Finally, —and chiefly— it denotes in the creation record the meaning *a creatio*, an *ex nihilo*, making out of nothing. This is the accepted biblical teaching and is implied in passages like Heb. 11, 3: "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God, so that things which are seen were

not made of things which do appear." Rom. 4, 17: "God, who quickeneth the dead and calleth those things which be not as though they were."

There was, therefore, as the phrase "in the beginning" implies, a time when God alone existed, when everything else was uncreated. Ps. 90, 2: "Before the mountains were brought forth or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God." Col. 1, 17: "He is before all things." This conception of creation out of nothing predicates the truth that matter, in whatever shape or form we see it as it surrounds us, is not eternal. In the face of the materialistic and dualistic theories which insist that matter is everlasting and that the spiritual phenomena of life depend upon matter the Bible plainly teaches that there was a time when everything except God took its beginning.

Moreover, this doctrine of God's creation rules out the philosophy of fatalism, the fallacy which teaches us that all things happen by irresistible necessity. The term "create" is the expression of the will and purpose of God. Rev. 4, 11: "Because of Thy will, all things are and were created." The world would not have been created, had not God of His own free volition willed its creation.

Again, this biblical picture of creation militates against the philosophic and religious theories of the dual existence, of the principles of good and evil. At the beginning there was only God, and by deduction, God being good, He could produce only good.

Particularly, however, is the biblical conception of creation opposed to the prevalent theories for the origin of the universe. It may be said without any theological bias that the present day scientific thought largely rejects the basic assumption of a special, predetermined, divine creation. According to the prevalent fatalism this world is an accident; and until recently this accident was dignified by the scientific title, the nebular hypothesis, which was advanced particularly by La Place (1796). According to this hitherto widely accepted theory there was an original mass of cloudlike, attenuated matter which filled all space around the sun. In this nebulous mass, we are told, rotating motion originated with a gradual cooling and contracting of the universe nebula. As a consequence of this rotation about the sun, the original nebula separated into a series of rings which continued to rotate, to cool and to contract, until they had been changed into the various planets, satellites and other bodies of the solar system, including, incidentally, our earth.

But contemporaneous scientific thought has thoroughly rejected the nebular hypothesis, although armchair scientists and certain underprivileged high

school teachers continue to endorse its claims. It has shown that the process of solidification through rotation is unscientific, and that the movement of the heavenly bodies is not in accord with the claims of this theory (Dir Robert Ball "In the High Heavens" p. 244: "The present condition of the solar system is surely no argument for the nebular theory. It might rather be said that it is inconceivable on the nebular theory how a system of this form could be constructed at all. Nine-tenths of the bodies in the solar system do not exhibit movements which would suggest that they were produced from a nebula.") In addition to the other scientific objections the Christian knows that according to the biblical presentation the creation of the world was a free, determined act of God, not an accident; that there was no preexistent material from which the world was made; that the origin of the solar system was subsequent to the creation of the world proper.

The nebular hypothesis has been supplanted by other theories, the most popular of which at present is the planetesimal theory. In his book, "The Sun's Children," Dr. T. C. Chamberlain of the University of Chicago, co-author with Dr. Moulton of this now widely accepted hypothesis, claims that instead of the contraction and cooling demanded by the nebular hypothesis, there were "disruptive approaches" in which a star, or "the residue of stellar wastage," the material from which the world was made, swept by the sun. "Its tidal action upon the sun aided the natural eruptive activities of the sun to eject masses of gas to great distances from the sun. . . . The attraction of the star upon these masses caused them to circulate around the sun instead of falling back as otherwise they would have done. . . . The larger nuclei gradually swept up this scattered material and developed into our present planetary system." This summary of the planetesimal hypothesis shows that it is open to these basic scriptural objections: it destroys the conception of God as the deliberate creator; it substitutes accident for divine love; and directly contradicts the Genesis account in its claim for the creation out of nothing and the subsequent origin of the solar system.

The mode of creation is also described to us in some significant details. Sometimes the creative activities are mediate, that is, there is a *materia ex qua* (the fifth day), the material out of which God makes His creations. For instance, in 1, 11 we read: "And God said: Let the earth bring forth grass." This does not justify the principle of the "two factors" according to which there would be in effect two creative forces, God and Nature. This thesis has been advanced by Luthard ("Apologie," 1, 70): "Die Schrift sagt uns, dass bei dem Fortschritt der Bildungen zwei Faktoren zusammengewirkt haben:

die selbsteigene Taetigkeit der Naturkraefte und die schoepferische Einwirkung Gottes." These natural forces are but the agencies through which the creative power of God operates.

More usually, however, the creation is immediate. God speaks and it is done. Thus we read: "And God said, Let there be light: and there was light" (1, 3). This "Wayyomer Elohim" here and in its subsequent occurrences in which the creative record bears an integral relation to the New Testament name for Christ, the "Logos," which is featured in the prolog to St. John's Gospel, the "Logos," the Word without which "was not anything made that was made," the Word that "was in the beginning with God," the Word that was God. The relation between St. John's obvious reference at the beginning of His Gospel to the beginning of Genesis is based on this conception: as the word which God spoke at the creation was the word that conveyed God's will, brought light, etc., so in the New Testament, Christ is the personified Word who conveys God's will to the world, brings light, etc. In each of the ten "Wayyomer Elohim's" (which prompted Jewish theology to say that by ten sayings was the world created.), we may, in the light of John 1, 1-4, find a direct reference to the personified Word, the Logos, the Christ.

Surveying the general mode of creation, it is obvious that there is a definite progression and organization. First the inanimate and then the animate; first the lower orders, then the higher orders; first the foods, then the animals; first the animals, then men; first the ground, then the plants; first the atmosphere, then the vegetable life. It is significant that some of the details in this progression coincide in astounding accuracy with the best of modern investigations.

In regard to the scope of creation, we note that the first verse of the Bible refers to heaven and earth and the conclusion, Gen. 2, 1, refers to the heaven and the earth and all their hosts. This is the Hebrew for the universe with its totality of all created things.

IV. The Creation in Detail

I. The First Day

After the general statement of the opening verse of the Bible, the remainder of the first chapter and much of the second chapter present the details of creation. Thus we are told that on the first day God created the mass of material from which the world was to be shaped and ordered. This "Weltstoff" is described with these characteristics: (a) It is "Thohu wabhohu." The basic

conception employed in these two Hebrew words (which according to Hebrew idiomatic usage really denote one emphasized conception) is (as a comparison of parallel passages, cognate Semitic roots and the most important versions illustrate) this, that in its original state the earth was uninhabited and lifeless, unorganized and undeveloped. It is to be noted that the very frequent description of this condition as a chaos is ruled out by the fact that no chaotic condition can be ascribed to our God.

Particularly significant, however, is the Restitution Theory popularized by Thomas Chalmers, a noted Scottish preacher of more than a century ago, and accepted by a number of modern interpreters (for example, the Scofield Reference Bible). He claimed that this being "without form and void," as well as the subsequent statement concerning darkness cannot have been the result of God's creative work, but that it was the consequence of God's anger. Therefore, he asserted, there must be a gap between the first and second verses of the Bible, verse 1 representing the original creation, verse 2 a new creation from the chaotic darkness of the old material. The reason for the chaos and darkness is ascribed to the rebellion and fall of the evil angels. "So, for example, J. H. Kurtz (*"Bibel und Astronomie,"* p. 94 ff.): "Die Verwuestung war eine Folge des Falles der Engel, woraus wir weiter schliessen, dass jene urweltliche Erde die Wohn- und Uebungsstaette desjenigen Teiles der Engeln war, die sich gegen Gott empoeerten."

In regard to the theory of restitution, there is not basis or semblance of support in any of the Scriptures. The sacred writers know of one and only one creation. Besides, this misinterprets the terms "thohu wabhohu," as a description of a sinful, chaotic state and it misunderstands the significance of the darkness.

In regard to the interval between the first and second verses of the Scripture, we are again before a theory for which there is not the slightest evidence in any portion of the Bible. It is particularly popular among those who wish to harmonize the statements of the Scripture with the present claims of the immense geologic ages. If an interval is interposed between verses 1 and 2, what hinders us from demanding a similar interval between verses 2 and 3, or between any two subsequent sections?

(b) A second characteristic of the unorganized and undeveloped world was darkness. This has no moral connotation whatever, but simply describes the condition resultant from the absence of light which was not yet created.

(c) The third aspect of the initial creative activity is this, that according to the second verse there were vast masses of water circumfused around the globe from which the dry land had not been separated.

(d) Finally the Spirit of God, the Holy Spirit, which often exercises the divine force required for creative activity, "hovered over the face of the waters." The term that denotes this "hovering" ("merachepheth") is found in only one other passage of Scripture, Deut. 2, 11. There it denotes the action of a bird brooding over the young ones to help develop them, and here, far from being a survival of the Phoenician notion of a world egg, it describes God's care and the presence of His developing, creative Spirit.

Since the Spirit of God closely surveys the creative activity, the world does not permanently remain in this unorganized state in which it is described in the second verse. Therefore we find the first recorded creative command with its fulfillment: "And God said, Let there be light and there was light" (v. 3). We not only see that the creation of light was a conscious and deliberate action (since the speaking of God predicated direct will and intention) but we also note the ease with which God accomplishes this stupendous creation. He merely speaks and His will is accomplished, as Ps. 33, 9 records: "He spake and it was done; He commanded and it stood fast." In His omnipotence it is not necessary for Him to indulge in long and tedious processes.

Even with our limited intellect and perception we can recognize the divine wisdom of God in the creation of light as the first of a series of creative steps. Light is the very life blood of nature and existence. Without it every material creation would fade and perish. Only in recent years have we begun to realize more deeply the inherent value of light in the various phases of human welfare. It is because of its many and beneficent attributes that physical light becomes a symbol of spiritual light and that the apostle in II Cor. 4, 6 takes reference to this creation of light and shows that there is a parallel creation when a sinner is made a child of God by faith in Christ. St. Paul writes: "God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness shineth in our hearts to give us the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."

This verse does not stop to expatiate on the nature of light nor on the processes involved in its dissemination. Genesis is not a scientific textbook although it contains no unscientific statements. Therefore the nature of light is not discussed.

Neither does the third verse tell us what kind of light was created. It is a stock argument advanced by opponents of the Bible that light cannot exist

independently of the sun; and that this record of the creation of light on the first day must contradict the subsequent statement that the sun was created on the fourth day. Shallow thinkers have been thrown into consternation by these statements. A popular commentary on Genesis asserts that the sun had already been brought into being on the first day but that it was invisible because of the thick darkness which surrounded the earth. On the fourth day, it is claimed, this darkness was removed and the sun became visible. Others have postulated a temporary sun for Gen. 1, 2 superseded by a permanent sun for Gen. 1, 14. Others have followed Augustine in claiming that while the light of v. 3 is spiritual, that of the fourth day is physical. These theories involve their own refutation. Today it should be clear that there is no contradiction in these two statements that light was created on the first day, although the sun was brought into existence only three days after. It is now recognized that light may be independent of the sun and that it may be produced by chemical or electrical or other action. As long as this fact can be demonstrated—and it is a truism of physics—there can be no quarrel between the record of these two creative days, even from the point of view of human science. To the mind of a Christian, who recognizes the omnipotence of his heavenly Father, there is no need to limit or restrict the divine potentiality even by the requirements of modern physics.

We are then told (v. 4) that God approved the creation of light as good, that He established a division between light and darkness, and that He named two conditions. The statement of divine approval (“And God saw the light that it was good”), marks the creation of light as corresponding to the divine intention, as perfect in the fulfillment of the purpose for which it had been created. Seven times in the first chapter is the Creator’s approving regard expressed in this summarizing “and God saw that it was good,” and each time it is the record of His full approval.

The separation of light and darkness indicates that henceforth both are to have their particular spheres and their special times of appearance. The creation of light did not make the darkness cease to exist. The interpretation which has been read into this verse by Dillmann, Driver and other critics (according to which it is held that the Hebrews believed that the light had a special dwelling place and the darkness another special dwelling place from which both emerge in a hidden, mysterious way) is utterly unwarranted. In the fifth verse we are told by the very names employed, day and night, that this separation is merely the institution of temporal rotation.

In regard to the designation by name (“and God called the light day and the darkness he called night”), we should note that God designed the distinction between light and darkness to be a permanent institution and that the naming is also for future adaptation by man. The fifth verse does not imply that God spoke Hebrew or does it permit any inference to be drawn as to the actual vowels and consonants employed. Our text may be the reproduction in Hebrew of the original designations. We cannot grant that the fifth verse records merely mental designation, without any oral pronunciation. It is significant, however, that the names which God gives the light and the darkness are not haphazard designations. In the Hebrew the terms employed are expressive of the characteristics and qualities of both day and night.

In the fifth verse we have the record of the completion of the first creative day. The dispute as to the length of this and the subsequent days has been long and in many instances fruitless. The church fathers held that God could have created the world and its parts in fractions of days; and so Augustine and others, with intentions more reverent than scriptural, held that the term “day” was used in a figurative sense and that it really designated but a single fleeting moment. Among many of our contemporaries the day has become too short and it is claimed that the term denotes age, epoch, eon, era. The exponents of these lengthy creation days declare that the term “yom” is often used in a figurative sense in the Old Testament; we grant this, but we insist that it is an hermeneutical principle of sound interpretation that we adhere to the original and literal meaning of a word, unless there are manifest reasons for adopting a figurative or derived interpretation. Such reasons are absent in Gen. 1. We are further told that passages such as Ps. 90, 4: “A thousand years in Thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past;” and II Pet. 3, 8: “One day is with the Lord as a thousand years,” show that the term “yom,” or its Greek equivalent, is specifically equated with one thousand years. And there are those who literally accept and teach the creation in six periods of 1,000 years each with a rest period of a subsequent thousand. But such contentions misunderstand the purpose of the passages cited. These Scriptures simply show the timelessness of God and emphasize the fact that God is not limited by the temporal restrictions imposed upon man. And if II Pet. 3, 8 is quoted to show that: “One day is with the Lord as a thousand years,” we can counter in the words of the same passage: “And a thousand years as one day.”—It is further claimed that the restriction of the term to a cosmic day of approximately twenty-four hours would involve too much haste. But this is only an unwar-

ranted restriction of God's omnipotence and gratuitously raises unnecessary difficulties.

On the contrary, we insist that "yom" represents a literal, cosmic day. This is the natural interpretation and we always adhere to the literal explanation unless the text itself shows that the term is to be interpreted figuratively. If it were not for the utterly absurd opinion that geology endorses a scheme of six ages and if it were not for a practical restriction of God's power, no one would dream of interpreting "yom" otherwise than as an ordinary day.—Moreover, the context demands this interpretation. It is specifically stated that this creative day consists of evening and morning. No twisting of terms is able to obviate the force of this simple statement. Ages, eras, epochs do not consist of morning and evening.—Again, this interpretation is demanded by parallel passages. In Ex. 20, 11 the Sabbath is instituted and it is stated that because God rested on the seventh day, He, therefore hallowed the Sabbath day. If we interpret the Sabbath as a day, we should accept the seventh day in the creative cycle in the same way.—Finally, the harmony of the creation account demands the normal interpretation. If vegetation is created in the third age and the sun in the fourth, the harmonist who could dovetail Genesis with his conception of science, must admit that the vegetable world existed through centuries or through millions of years without a ray of sunlight.

2. *The Second Day*

On the second day the creative command calls for the 'raqia.' Etymologically this word, which is translated "firmament," comes from a root which means to hammer with an instrument and then to spread out by hammering. It therefore denotes that this is extenuated, stretched out. This firmament is not only the layer of air between the earth and the clouds, but the entire atmosphere above the earth, as the record of the fourth day implies. In the creative account it is described as in the midst of the water. This implies that the firmament is to separate the water circumfused all over the globe, so that some of this water is forced downward and some upward, by the creation of the "raqia."

Now we are familiar with the water below. This is the terrestrial waters in the many shapes they have assumed. The globe, after the creation on the second day, was still a watery mass, but it was far different from the watery mass of verse 2. Instead of emptiness above the face of the deep, there was the atmospheric firmament. As to the waters above the firmament, they may be not only the clouds and the moisture of the sky, but perhaps other water

concerning which we know nothing from the scientific point up to this time. It is with more than ordinary interest, therefore, that the Christian Bible student watches the stratosphere voyages. But even if this water above the firmament be restricted to the moisture of the clouds, this constitutes one of God's greatest wonders. It has been estimated that if the entire population of the world were to stand at the sea shore and bail out the ocean with buckets, more than 70,000 years of such uninterrupted toil would be required to dip out as much water as that found in the clouds during a single year.

Of the six creative days, probably the second day seems to be the least important and noteworthy to the casual Bible reader. The air, the atmosphere, the firmament are often accepted as self evident. But a mere superficial consideration of the respiratory system or the functioning of the senses shows the essential nature of this day's creation. And it would be tempting to indulge in a description of the divine wisdom that is displayed in the harmonious functions of the atmosphere. For instance, in that natural phenomenon by which animals breathe in the oxygen of the air and set carbonic acid free for the benefit of the plants, while vegetation absorbs carbonic acid and sets oxygen free for the use of animals. But these various functions and harmonious blessings together with the major atmospheric functions of disseminating heat, evaporating moisture, equalizing climate, spreading winds, forms a theme which in itself could not be exhausted in the entire time at our disposal.

Attention has repeatedly been called to the fact that the record of the second day has no statement to the effect "and God saw that it was good," as we find this at the record of the other days. We do not know why this expression of divine approval is missing. The Septuagint and other versions have inserted it; but it was never found in the Hebrew text. As to the evident manifest goodness of the firmament there can be no doubt, particularly in view of the comprehensive benediction of verse 31. It may be that the separation of the waters by a firmament was regarded only as a preliminary creative act, preparatory to the third day.

3. The Third Day

On the third day there are two major creations, dry land and vegetation. In regard to the first, we note the divine command: "And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear." (v. 9) This "one place" does not mean that all of the water on the globe was to be gathered to a single place and restricted to its confines,

but that the water was to be in one place and the dry land in another. No longer were they to be circumfused. A separation was to take place.

No details are given in connection with this stupendous creative activity. The English writer Charles Kingsley recalls an incident which, he tells us, emphasized in his own mind the majesty and omnipotence of God. A little hill was to be removed from his estate and as the workmen spent days in carting away load after load of earth, without making a noticeable change in its size, he began to reflect upon the greatness of the God who had made the Alps, the uncounted hills and mountains all over the earth, the earth itself, in its unmeasured immensity. And although no particulars relative to the methods by which the dry land was formed are presented, no statement of any kind relative to the creation of the various altitudes, the covering of the soil, the stratification of rocks, the various metals and precious gems, the Christian is constrained by this overpowering evidence of God's omnipotence to raise his heart and voice to God in hymns and prayers of adoration.

The account of this scriptural statement as to the creation of dry land is flatly contradicted by modern geological claims. Geology teaches the slow, gradual formation of the earth's surface. The Bible teaches the separation of land and water on one day. And as proof for their opinion, geologists assert that the processes required for the formation of the earth, as well as for the age of the earth, may be traced by the different layers of rock formation or strata and by the fossils (remains of plants, animals or men, petrified or otherwise, or simply the traces of these—found in rock formations). Accordingly it is asserted that only the simplest and most elementary form of animal and vegetable life is found represented in the oldest layers of rock formation (the paleozoic group of strata), while the fossils of the secondary or mesozoic strata represent a pronounced advance. The fossils of the tertiary or cenozoic group, it is further claimed, furnish highly developed fossils of mammals and highly developed plants. And finally, this theory concludes, the quarternary (or post-tertiary group of strata) are the youngest, since they furnish the most recent fossils, remnants of man. In all this development hundreds of millions or even billions of years were required before the surface of the earth could become essentially that which it is today.

As in the case of any scientific theorization which runs counter to the Word of God there are manifest weaknesses and inconsistencies in these geologic trends. Thus, in an examination of actual evidence we note that there are large areas in which strata and fossils have been found in an order entirely different from that required by this theory. Natural science in itself offers

nothing to corroborate these scheme of life succession that are so frequently flaunted before the eyes of our impressionable youth. The entire classification of geologic ages and the theory of life succession are but the corollaries of the evolutionary teaching so that the whole geological theorization becomes an immense *argumentum in circulo*. The geologist dates his strata on the basis of evolutionary claims and the evolutionist builds up his theory on the resultant premises of geology.

Upon the dry land and sea thus created, God bestows His divine approval. We read (v. 10) "and God saw that it was good." Now the goodness of the terra firma becomes evident when we pause to consider the blessings that have come to men through the covering of soil, through the vast storehouses of divine providence that are found below the surface in minerals and metals and granites and marbles, the precious gems and the priceless jewels, as well as by the inexhaustible catalog of other detailed blessings. Similarly no elaboration is required for the goodness of the sea with its influence for climate, fertility and health, its lavish provision of food and in the means of communication and transportation and in the other countless blessings which it affords.

The second creation of the third day is vegetation. We note that here we are confronted with an immediate creation because the command of v. 11 reads: "Let the earth bring forth grass." Vegetation is thus to be called into existence through the agency of the earth. But this productive power of the earth is not automatic or inherent. As we have seen, there are no "two factors" in the creation. The creative power is God's and He simply employs the facilities of the earth.

We note that there is a threefold classification of vegetation. First is the grass which includes all grasslike growths. No description of the grass is presented in the record of the third day, probably because none is required. The second division in vegetation is translated as "herbs," while the Hebrew "esebh" seems to include particularly the vegetables, perhaps all vegetation between the grasses and the trees. The third class is the trees, called specifically fruit trees. This is not an exclusive reference to trees that produce fruit in the modern sense of the term; all kinds of trees were created although the sacred writer mentions particularly the fruit trees, as the more important part of this classification.

In the case of the last two groups (the vegetables and the trees), specific reference is made to the fact that they yield seed. This is illustrative of the divine and providential arrangement for the continuity and future growth of

vegetation. It provides for the pure propagation of species and definitely answers the question which disturbed scholastic minds, the query as to which was the first, the oak or the acorn. The presentation of the text is definitely this that God has created grown plants, grown grass, grown trees. Six times ("yielding seed," "Whose seed is in it," etc.) does the creative record of the third day emphasize God's care and provision for the propagation of the vegetable world. The abundant provision of the divine Creator for the propagation and growth of the vegetable world may be seen, for example, in the instance of the elm tree, which Adam Clark mentions in his commentary, when he computes the theoretical potentialities of vegetative propagation. He says: "At first one seed is deposited in the earth; from this one tree springs, which in the course of its vegetative life produces one thousand five hundred and eighty-four millions of seeds. This is the first generation. The second generation will amount to two trillions, five hundred and nine thousand and fifty-six billions. The third generation will amount to three thousand nine hundred and seventy-four quadrillions, three hundred and forty-four thousand seven hundred and four trillions! And the fourth generation from these would amount to six sextillions, three hundred ninety-five thousand three hundred and sixty-two quintillions, eleven thousand one hundred and thirty-six quadrillions! Sums too immense for the human mind to conceive." (p. 32)

In the instance of the vegetables and the trees the creation record specifically states that they were created "according to their kind." Thus, at the very beginning of the creation of vegetative life, we are reminded that the Bible teaches the creation of species, not a development of species. It is not possible that one species can develop from another and permanently maintain itself. There may be a development of subspecies but there is usually a reversion to type. An argument frequently advanced against the accuracy of the scriptural "according to their kind," as it is applied to the plant world, is the alleged creation of new species through the horticultural manipulations. It is stated that men are able to create new kinds of plants and fruits and that this is in direct opposition to the statements of Scripture. In this connection, however, the following facts should be considered: This procedure is not the production of a new species. It may simply be the altering or ennobling of a species already extant. We must distinguish between "species" and "variety." There are some 6,000 varieties of roses—but surely not 6,000 species. These roses may be crossbred, but it is impossible to cross a rose and an orange tree and produce a self-propagating growth. Again, this is an artificial procedure; for, when the molding and restraining influence of man is removed

there will be a reversion to type. The most interesting flowers that may be produced after years of experimentation will always, when not cultivated, return to their original state. Finally, this is an unnatural process; for such new creations usually die out immediately. Burbank produced some 40,000 hybrids, a cross of blackberry plus raspberry, but several years ago reports showed only one of these hybrids in existence. Hybrids cannot reproduce themselves.

It need hardly be added that this account of the origin of vegetation is fundamentally opposed to the scheme for the beginning and evolution of vegetation which at present holds sway in materialistic science. According to this, in the earliest periods, the Laurentian and the Huronian, there were only doubtful or indeterminable indications of plant life. Definite vegetation began with the marine plants of the Cambrian period, while the earliest land plants made their appearance in the Silurian. From that time on there is said to have been a steady development of vegetation until our Post-tertiary period. This scheme of life succession is another phase of the argument in *circulo*; for there can be no definite proof either of its premises or of its detailed claims, e.g., for the assertion that while the earliest modern trees appeared in the Jurassic period of the Mesozoic age, the palm trees originated only millions of years later in the Tertiary period of the Cenozoic. This is academic theorization incapable of scientific demonstration.

Similarly the account of the third day repudiates the related theory of any vegetative autogenesis. For decades scientists have found in a spontaneous generation of plant life their account of the origin of vegetation. But there is a marked recent trend to acknowledge an immeasurable something in plants which makes them living things and which cannot be accounted for by spontaneous generation, the last resort of most evolutionists.

4. The Fourth Day

The fourth day begins with the creation in which God says: "Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven" (v. 14). On this day God made "the greater light," the sun, "the lesser light," the moon, and the stars, including the planets. The sun and the moon are mentioned only by this circumlocution and they are not named by God as the dry land, the firmament, day and night, on the preceding creative days. There is no adequate and convincing explanation for the absence of this naming beyond the bare observation that God simply does not name everything that is brought into existence (the vegetative growths, the animals, etc.). There is no explanation of the tremendous processes by which the solar system was created. But the now discredited

nebular hypothesis and its most popular substitute, the planetesimal hypothesis are irreconcilably opposed to the Scripture and have had their vulnerable parts exposed by physicians and astronomers. But no matter by what process and in what way the host of the heavenly bodies came into existence, they constitute, from many different points of view, some of the most stupendous of all creative acts. Their immense size, their innumerable multitude, their precision and regularity—all impress us with a feeling of our own insignificance and the transcendent majesty of God, particularly when we realize that they are but the works of His finger (Ps. 8, 3).

The purpose of these heavenly luminaries occupies a much larger place than in any other creative day. The sun, moon and stars are first of all “to divide the day from the night” (v. 14), that is, they are to be permanent regulators that distinguish between the light and darkness. When the sun comes it brings the day, just as the moon rules over the night. But these luminaries are also to be “for signs.” This is not a charter for astrologists, for the Scriptures condemn this as every superstition which leads men away from the trust in God. Jer. 10,2: “Thus saith the Lord, Learn not the way of the heathen and be not dismayed at the signs of heaven; for the heathen are dismayed at them.” These heavenly bodies are to be for signs in the ordinary sense of this term. Their position, for example, is a sign of the various seasons, an indicator for the calendar. Their appearance is also significant in connection with the forecasting of the weather, etc. In addition, however, they are to serve as special signs, and so throughout the Scriptures we read that the heavenly bodies are often constituted as indicators of God’s coming dispensations. Instances in which these luminaries appear as foreboding signs are found, for example, in Amos 8, 9: “I will cause the sun do go down at noon and I will darken the earth in the clear day.” Joel 2, 30-31: “And I will shew wonders in the heavens . . . the sun shall be turned into darkness and the moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come.” Luke 21, 25: “And there shall be signs in the sun and in the moon and in the stars.” These and other passages declare that when the last day and the judgment comes, the very heavens above us will announce the coming of God. Stars have served as special mentors for men, for example, in Matt. 2, 2: “the star of Bethlehem.”

Besides dividing between day and night, and being constituted as natural and special signs, the creation account tells us that these luminaries are to be “for seasons and for days and for years,” that is, they are to help regulate the sacred calendar (the seasons are the set religious festivals), and the secular calendar by combining the days into years. No mention is made of weeks and

significantly not of months, although the latter were sharply defined by the lunar phases.

A final purpose is that recorded in v. 15: "To give light upon the earth." Although light was the first creation (v. 3), it was not sunlight. Now, from the fourth day on, light is to emanate from this heavenly luminary.

The entire presentation of these purposes shows definitely that the biblical statements make the solar system geocentric. This does not mean, of course, that the earth is the geometrical center of the solar system; but it does imply that all these heavenly bodies, whatever other purpose they may serve, exist for the sake of the earth. The entire modern conception of the universe makes our world only an accidental, relatively insignificant part of the solar system and we can understand why, when the Scriptures emphatically declare that the heavenly bodies are subsidiary to the world. Skinner, in the "Critical Commentary" declares: "The whole conception is as unscientific (in the modern sense) as it could be." In spite of the generally accepted scientific picture of the helio-centricity of the solar system the attitude of the entire Bible is geocentric. Consequently when the world ends, the sun, moon and stars will lose the reason for their existence and will likewise end, as it is stated in II Pet. 3, 7 and Matt. 24, 29.

Upon the stupendous productions of this fourth day God places His benediction. He "saw that it was good" (v. 18). There was in all the limitless reaches of the stellar regions nothing that was not in every way perfect, nothing that did not meet the minute requirements of perfection.

5. *The Fifth Day*

Animal life originates on this day. Gerhard calls the fifth day the birthday of the fish and the birds. A literal translation of v. 20 declares "And God said, "Let the waters swarm with swarming things," namely living creatures. Apparently the word "swarm" designates not only fish, as this term is often limited in popular interpretations, but also all creatures of small size that are found in large quantities, including insects, worms, etc. These smaller creatures, together with the swarms of fish, were produced by the water. As the earth was the element through which vegetation came into being, so water is the element through which these swarming creatures and fish were produced. But the water, as the land on the third day, receives its power only through the command of God.

In regard to the fowl, or as we should translate "flying creatures," "winged creatures," (since Lev. 11, 20 ff. shows that the term is used not only of birds

but also of winged insects) there has been a debate among Lutheran theologians as to the *materia ex qua*, the material from which these winged creatures were formed. Luther and Kalov decided for *ex aqua*; Baier and Hollaz *ex terra*. It seems that Gen. 2, 19 favors the *ex terra*: "out of the land the Lord God formed every beast of the field and every fowl of the air." Dr. Walther refuses to take sides in this issue which has more professional than practical interest.

In the detailed account of the fifth day's creation we read that God made "great whales," v. 21. The term employed here ("tanninim") is variously applied in the Scriptures to land animals, serpents, dragons, crocodiles or aquatic monsters without the narrower definition. At this place it seems to refer in general to monstrous creatures, for the root from which the term is derived denotes elongated, stretched-out creatures. As such it may refer to creatures like whales, crocodiles, cattle fish, but in addition, the term may also embrace the saurian reptiles who, because of their gigantic size and their nature, could well be comprehended in this designation and accommodated in this part of the creative record.

In surveying the scriptural account of the origin of life we are impressed by the fact that there is no room for any accidental, spontaneous generation, or for any unexplainable ancestral blob of protoplasm, like that which Van Loon pictures floating on the surface of primeval slime. The best of all modern science will agree with the statement made last year by Sir Fredrick Gowland Hopkins, president of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in his presidential address before that society: "Though speculations concerning the origin of life have given intellectual pleasure to man, all that we know about it is that we know nothing."

At the very beginning of animal life the creation according to species is emphasized both for the swarming creatures and for the winged creatures. As in the case of the vegetable world, these verses remind us that there is a creation according to species and not an evolution of species. There may be some difference of opinion as to what the term "min" denotes, but we may well accept it as the largest division that will crossbreed with fertility.

Upon all the creatures which His omnipotence called forth on this day, God pronounces His divine approval. As they were created by His master hand, they were all good. Their rapacious tendencies and their hostility to man and to other creatures was not a part of their original endowment. It was of later and tragic origin.

But in addition to this “and God saw that it was good” (v. 21), we have on the fifth day the first spoken blessing of the creation. God blessed these creatures, saying: “Be fruitful and multiply and fill the waters in the seas, and let fowl multiply in the earth” (v. 22). The blessing of God here, as elsewhere, is associated with fertility, with the power and ability to increase. God not only gives the command, but He also bestows the ability. The prolific powers of reproduction among fish are astounding. We are told: “The roe of the codfish, according to Harmer’s estimate, contains 3,686,000 eggs; of the flounder 225,000; of the mackerel 500,000; of the tench 350,000; of the carp 203,000; of the roach 100,000; of the sole nearly 100,000; of the pike 50,000; of the herring, the perch, and the smelt from 20,000 to 30,000.”

Of the reproductive powers of the birds we read: “Whole islands are buried beneath their mere excrement to the depth of several feet. Captain Flinders saw a flock of sooty petrels pass over him in Van Dieman’s Land, which could not have contained less than 150,000,000. And Mr. Audubon estimated that a flock of pigeons that passed over him, on the banks of the Ohio, must have contained one billion, one hundred and fifteen millions! which would require for their support not less than eight millions of bushels of grain or seed daily!” (Morris: “Work Days of God,” 294 ff.)

All of this occurred on the fifth day, but in Sir J. W. Dawson’s “Chain of Life and Geological Time” we find that the lowliest marine animals began in the second period, the Huronian; the fish two periods later in the Silurian; the birds four periods later in the Jurassic, so that while the Scriptures trace all to God’s omnipotence and restrict the creation of smaller creatures, fish and birds to one day, the modern theories make these creatures accidental developments and hypothesize their evolution through many hundreds of millions of years!

6. The Sixth Day

We are approaching the climax of creation. On the sixth day we have first of all the record of the creation of the land animals (vv. 24 and 25). Here again there is a *creatio mediata*. The earth is to be the agency through which the land animals are created. And once again the earth derives its creative power from God.

There is a threefold classification of the land animals: first the dumb animals (“bhehemah,” a term usually employed to designate domesticated animals); then the moving, creeping creatures (“remes,” a comprehensive designation of the smaller land animals that move in slow, creeping fashion); and the living things of the earth (“chavetho-eret.” the wild animals).

Again, in five distinct statements these verses emphasize that the land animals were produced according to their species. One statement to this effect would have been sufficient; but when vv. 24 and 25 have five records to this effect, the statement has the importance which is always attached to Hebrew repetition.

Again, God approves of His creation (v. 25). According to His divine plan for the organization of the world, no land animal was originally made without a purpose and no creature failed to live up to that purpose. No creature that God created was bad. There was no evidence of the degeneracy which we meet in present day animals.

It is to be noted that no blessing is extended to the land animals. This does not mean, of course, that they were not blessed. The text simply does not record this. It seems that the sacred writer is hurrying to the great climax of creation and that he does not pause to mention a blessing. Perhaps the benediction of the animals is included in the blessing upon the first parents spoken at the close of the sixth day.

The second creation of the sixth day and the last of the creative cycle is the production of man. It is to be noted that for this final creation God does not say: "Let there be a man" nor "Let the earth produce a man," but that for the first and only time in the entire chronicle of creation, God prefaces His activity with a deliberate resolution: "And God said, Let us make man" (v. 26). This remarkable plural, used otherwise in Gen. 3, 22; 11, 7 and Is. 6, 8, has been variously explained. An old Jewish interpretation treats it as a niphala particle, a syntactical monstrosity and an absurdity of interpretation which is flatly contradicted by the following plurals.—Other, for example Delitzsch, regard it as a plural communicative to the angels and picture God as taking counsel with His celestial court consulting them before He created the highest of His works. But this cooperation of the angels is ruled out by the majesty of God. Is. 40,13 asks: "Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being His counsellor, hath taught Him?" Besides, man is not made in the image of God and the angels which would be the logical assumption if we were to translate "Let us (God and the angels) make man in our (God's and the angels') image."—Higher critics have said that this plural is a vestige of original polytheism. But the Scriptures are at pains to emphasize that God and God alone is the Author of man's existence.—Still others (Driver, for example) have explained the "let us make" as a plural "indicative, no doubt, of the fullness of attributes and powers conceived as united in the Godhead." But even enthusiastic critics have found that this overtaxed both the Hebrew

as “an objectivization of the subject” or as a plural of self deliberation, in which God speaks to Himself. But this is both unnatural and without any parallel in the Bible.—Throughout the history of the Church this plural has been interpreted as plural or as indicative of the three persons in the one divine Godhead. And no decisive reasons can be advanced against this interpretation, and the Trinity, as has been pointed out, is not a strange and unexpressed doctrine in the Old Testament.—The superiority of man’s creation is shown, then, first of all, by the fact that it is preceded by a preliminary counsel of the Trinity.

A second point of superiority in man’s origin is his creation in the image of God. The words of God, “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness,” (v. 26) can be reproduce in idiomatic English and in the sense of the original with “Let us make man in our very image.” Now this emphatic likeness of God does not consist in any corporeal agreement (Skinner), for God is a Spirit.—Nor is it to be found in man’s selfconscious reason (Criver), for man’s intelligence bears hardly a faint resemblance to the omniscience of God.—Neither is God’s image and likeness to be found in man’s preeminence and rule over nature (Chrysostom, the Socinians), for man received this dominion after he had been created in the image of God, and his limited rule is anything but the exact likeness of God.—Finally, this divine likeness is not the original free will of man (Hard-Davies), on the theory that man is distinguished from the beast and is similar to his Creator in this that he is not a mere creature of instinct. He has personality and freedom of action. But it will require little study to demonstrate that while man may have been originally separated from the beast on the score of free will, this preeminence does not make him in the very image and likeness of God.—If the image of God does not consist of corporeal or intellectual likeness; if it is not to be sought in man’s communion or his free will, it must be found in his spiritual likeness. And the plain teaching of Scripture is that man was created with a knowledge of God and in a state of perfect holiness which was a resplendent image of God. This is the plain teaching of the two passages that deal specifically with the description of the image of God. Col. 3, 9.10: “Put off the old man with his deeds; and . . . put on the new man which is renewed in knowledge *after the image of Him* that created him;” and Eph. 4, 24: “Put on the new man, *which after God is* created in righteousness and true holiness.”

There are two notable consequences of this divine image: first, immortality (for according to Gen. 2, 17 death and its preliminaries are a consequence of sin, so also Rom. 5, 12; 6, 23, etc.), and then, the dominion over the crea-

tures, another preeminence attached to the creation of man. According to v. 26 man is to rule “over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the air and over the cattle and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.” According to the original and divine institution the earth and its creatures are thus to be under the direction and control of man. That there is now a pronounced hostility on the part of nature toward man and that man’s rule over the brute world has been drastically restricted is the result of the later and tragic developments in the Fall. There are those, however, who do find an original opposition against which man had to contend. In a radio address last month (July 15) the President of the United Lutheran Church declared: “Man, when he appeared, was given this commission, ‘Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it.’ That work ‘subdue’ is significant. Its original in Hebrew means ‘to trample under foot,’ and is used elsewhere to describe the overcoming of enemies in a land to be occupied. Manifestly then man’s original mission on earth was to overcome an opposition. He was sent for that purpose. The word ‘subdue’ is too strong to designate merely man’s rule over animals and elemental nature. Some violent antagonism is supposed. When man entered upon the stage of this earth it was not as subservient as is usually pictured.” This opposition he finds, by adaptation of the old Restitution-Interval Theory, in the rebellion of the fallen angels. I have already rejected this theory, but it can be shown here that the extraordinary emphasis on “subdue” (v. 26) is unwarranted. An examination of the passages in which it occurs shows that it is used not only for the overcoming of violent opposition, but that it is also frequently employed to designate the conception of rule without “the overcoming of enemies.” A comparison of passages like I Kings 9, 23, II Chron. 8, 10, Lev. 25, 53, and an investigation of the use of the Hebrew verb *radhah* in these places will corroborate its usage in the sense of “to rule.”

A fourth point of supremacy in the creation of man (in addition to the preliminary counsel of the Trinity, the creation in the image of God, the dominion over the world and its creatures) is found in the detailed account of the processes by which man came into existence. In the supplementary narrative, Gen. 2, 7, we read of the personal care which God Himself bestowed upon His supreme creation, forming him out of dust, or soil, of the ground. In no other case is it recorded that God formed any of His creations. Then God Himself breathed into the lifeless form of man the breath of life. In this inbreathing of God our dogmaticians have correctly found an element of human existence which is different from the life principle which the animals

have and that is the soul. At the same time this verse (2, 7) substantiates the position which Lutheran dogmatics have consistently upheld, namely that of dichotomy. This holds that man consists of two essential parts, the body and soul; and it is opposed by trichotomy, which differentiates between body, soul and spirit. Harmonious with the dichotomous position is the evidence, for example, of Matt. 10, 28: "Rather fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."

A further characteristic superiority of the creation of man is the fact that only one human pair was created, while the other creatures were produced in mass creation. A corollary of this creation of a single parent-pair emphasizes the unity of the entire human race (Acts 17, 26: "Of one blood"; Rom. 5, 12: "Through one man"). There is thus no room for pre-Adamites or co-Adamites. Adam was the *primus homo* and the unity of the human race is attested by scientific research which emphasizes fundamental similarity between all races of men in mental and physical characteristics; the absence of the universal law of hybridity; the historical evidence which traces the human race to one center, the tabulation of common instincts, traditions and influences as well as the natural knowledge of God.

A further preeminence of the human origin as described in the biblical account is the emphasis which the sacred record lays upon the two sexes and the creation of woman. For the first time the distinction between male and female is made. By implication, sex and subsequently marriage, as instituted by God, are the holy endowments of a heavenly Father. To mention them in skeptical, sarcastic or derogatory terms, to make these divine institutions the butt of miscalled humor is, in finally analysis, to blaspheme the Creator. It is true that sex and marriage today have lost their original and complete holiness. But because of their divine origin they must be regarded by all Christians as preeminent gifts of God's power and love.—In the face of isolated attempts in the early Church and even later to deny the divine image of woman, the Church has consistently pointed out that Gen. 1, 27, classifying those who were made in God's image, specifically states "male and female." Gen. 1, 28 gives the divine rule over the world and its creatures to both Adam and Eve. It is unwarranted masculine arrogance to say, as some have, that Adam was gifted with an intelligence superior to Eve's.—In the creation of woman we note that she is regarded as a necessary complement to the happiness of man (2, 18); that woman was not made from the ground, as man, perhaps she was destined to show by her origin her very close and intimate relation with man; that man was made first then woman, a fact which I Tim. 2, 12 and 13 uses in

this way: "I suffer not a woman to teach nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve;" that the creation of his helpmate was greeted as an event of great joy by Adam.

Finally, a further preeminence found in the creation of man is the gift of superior intelligence and the endowment of human speech. Man was not created inarticulate and with a child's mentality. Nor did he develop rationality and the power of connected speech through long and intricate states of cultural rise. He is presented to us in the creation record not as a leering, low-skulled, human half-brute creature, but as possessed with highly developed intelligence (Gen. 2, 20-23). Luther thought so highly of Adam's mental abilities and intelligence in the perfection of the state of sinlessness that he declared of all Old Testament figures, only Adam should rightly be called a doctor of philosophy. The extremes to which evolutionary scientists have gone in their attempt to discredit this biblical narrative and derive man's speech from the cries of animals and develop it through long processes are shown in Jespersen's "Progress in Language" (pp. 329-331) where he discusses, under their nicknames, the theories which seek to account for the origin of language and its development: the bow-wow theory, the ding-dong theory, the pooh-pooh theory, and the yo-he-yo theory.

With the enumeration of these particulars in which man's creation is unique, there is not room for any theory of a gradual evolution of man from lower animal stages. In spite of the widely disseminated arguments that would substantiate organic evolution (the arguments from paleontology, morphology, embryology, blood tests, human characteristics in animals, geographical distributions, the march of progress and history, and similar contentions) the Church repudiates the claims to man's brute ancestry because the creation record is emphatic in denouncing both the premises and deductions of evolutionism. Repeatedly are we told that the animals were created after their kind and there is an abundance of other scriptural testimony which teaches that God is the direct Creator of everything animate and inanimate. In spite of all the attempts of theistic evolutionists to bring about a harmony between revealed Christianity and Darwinism, there is not room for a compromise. As a second line of argumentation we hold that the brute origin of man is opposed to true science, as well as ultimately contrary to public welfare and morals.

Upon this first human parent pair, as it had been created with all these preeminences God pronounces His benedictions: "Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth" (1, 28). This is the first recorded command of God to the human race and it must not be overlooked that this command is joined

with a blessing. It has been argued that these words are not a command but a blessing. The fact of the matter is that they are both command and blessing. The imperative is commonly employed "to express real commands" (Gesenius 100, a). Experience has shown that even after the entrance of sin into the family relation, much more blessing and happiness is found in those homes where this command is kept than where this divine institution is studiously disregarded because of convenience, fashion, business, and similar causes. The wilful limitation of offspring (by contraceptive birth control) is a sinful evasion and any arrangement which prevents parents from accepting this blessing and assuming this responsibility is to be condemned. God not only gave this command to the human race, but in any extraordinary measure He also endowed humanity with the ability to fulfil its requirements. Someone has figured out that there have existed upon our globe more than thirty-six sextillion persons. Even an approach to exactness in such calculations is, of course, impossible. But the growth of human population from the first parents to the approximately two billion population of today serves to illustrate the powers for propagation which God bestowed with His blessing.

With the sixth day the active creative work proper ends. There are interesting questions upon which the creation chapters do not touch, a discussion of which would carry us too far afield at this time. At the close of the sixth day we read: "And God saw everything that He made and behold it was very good" (1, 31), that is, it was not only good, as was recorded in the instance of the previous creations, but in the totality and combination of everything that went to make up the world with its flora and fauna and its surrounding galaxies of stars, it was good in the extreme, "tovh meodh." This summary statement repudiates pessimism, which holds that if no world at all were created the situation would be much better than it is with the present world. And equally emphatically it denies the doctrine which insists that God is in any way responsible for evil. The question which has provoked much more dogmatical discussion than it deserves: "Is this the best world that God could create?" is a useless query of meticulous scholasticism.

The seventh day is not a part of the creative cycle proper, and we can pass over the details of a discussion which would corroborate our Lutheran opinion that this first seventh day which marked the cessation of God's labor is in no sense of the term a Sabbath and was not recognized and observed in patriarchal times as a holy day. The Sabbath is ceremonial legislation which originated in codified form in Ex. 20.

We have thus discussed some of the most salient issues in our biblical

we ask God to give us the spiritual wisdom and the gratitude of Spirit-filled souls which will make us regard the wonders of His creation as they are perpetuated before our eyes every day with a feeling of devout reverence and heart-deep gratitude! Only the heedless and godless can pass through this world without being reminded daily both of the munificence and the magnificence of God's Church, as "His creation by water and by blood," longs for the blessings of heaven, the common doxology, that psalm of praise raised from millions of grateful hearts on each Lord's Day, bids us and the angels:

Praise God from Whom all blessings flow,

Praise Him, ye creatures, here below,

Praise Him above, ye heavenly hosts,

Praise Father, Son and Holy Ghost!

Jesus' Prophecies Concerning His Death and Resurrection

**Circuit 8 Pastoral Conference
Mt. Olive Lutheran Church
Mankato, MN 5/26/92**

by William B. Kessel

The Apostle Paul reminded the Corinthians of the importance of the gospel message which he proclaimed. He wrote, "by this gospel you are saved, if you hold firmly to the word I preached to you. Otherwise, you have believed in vain" (I Cor. 15:2). What, then, is the content of this message of salvation? Paul refuses to leave his readers in doubt. "For what I received I passed on to you as of first importance: that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures. . ." (I Cor. 15:3).

This statement of Paul in no way detracts from the importance of Christ's active obedience. Jesus lived a perfect life under the law in order to redeem those under the law (Gal. 4:4-5; Rom. 5:19). Without His perfect life there could be no salvation. Likewise, Jesus allowed Himself to suffer and be put to death for the sins of all mankind (I Pet. 3:18; Heb. 2:14). Without His passive obedience there could be no salvation. In directing the Corinthians' attention to the cross, Paul was not denying the importance of Christ's perfect life. He was, rather, looking at the completion of Christ's entire saving mission.

If the life and death of Jesus Christ are part of the saving gospel message, then so is Christ's resurrection. Paul underscores the importance of Easter, "And if Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile; you are still in your sins. . . . But Christ has indeed been raised from the dead, the firstfruits of those who have fallen asleep" (I Cor. 15:17, 20). Martin Luther, commenting on 1 Corinthians 15:12-15, adds his "amen." He states, "Paul stakes everything on the basic factor with which he began, namely, that Christ arose from the dead. This is the chief article of the Christian doctrine. No one who at all claims to be a Christian or a preacher of the Gospel may deny that" (Luther 1973:94).

The saving gospel, then, includes both the message of Christ's perfect life culminating in His death on the cross as well as His resurrection. As Paul wrote to the Romans (4:25) "He [Jesus] was delivered over to death for our sins and was raised to life for our justification." Finally as Paul wrote to Pastor Timothy, "Remember Jesus Christ, raised from the dead, descended from David. This is my gospel, for which I am suffering. . . ." (2 Tim. 2:8)

The Source of Doctrine Concerning Christ's Death and Resurrection

When Lutheran dogmaticians wish to draw attention to the central teaching of Christianity, they have a wealth of Scriptural materials at their disposal. The Old Testament contains numerous prophecies concerning the Messiah's life, death, and resurrection. Gospel writers in the New Testament era provided historical accounts of Jesus' earthly sojourn. Meanwhile, the epistles of theologians like St. Paul are replete with statements about Christ's saving work.

It would not be theologically defensible to prefer one category of gospel verses over another. The Savior prophecies found in Isaiah are not "better" than the salvation conclusions reached in the epistles to the Corinthians. The view of Christ on the cross in Psalm 22 is not more or nor less accurate than that of eyewitness John. Yet there is one category of gospel verses which forms an effective bridge between the Testaments and between prophecy and fulfillment. These are the verses which constitute Christ's own prophecies concerning His death and resurrection. And it is these verses which will now receive our attention.

During the three and a quarter years of His public ministry, Jesus repeatedly prophesied about His death and resurrection. Theologians, for the most part, select certain of these prophecies as representative of the whole. Adam Fahling (1946:577), for example, notes that there were "many references in the records to His death" but then cites only six. Likewise H. F. Bayer (1992:630) acknowledges that "The Synoptic Gospels in particular contain repeated predictions of the passion and resurrection of Jesus." He then focuses on three of them. For analytical purposes, however, it is necessary not just to sample Jesus' prophecies but to consider them in their entirety. A list of Jesus' death and resurrection prophecies is provided below. The various stages of Jesus' ministry are separated by dash marks.

*Jesus Predicts His Death and/or Resurrection
in the Gospel Accounts*

MATTHEW	MARK	LUKE	JOHN	PERIOD
			2:19-22 3:14	Early Judean Ministry
9:15 12:38-40	2:19-20	5:34-35		Galilean Ministry
16:1-4 16:21 of 17:2-3 17:9-12 17:22-23	8:31-32 9:2-4 9:9-12 9:30-32	9:22 9:29-31 9:43-45		Period With- drawals
20:18-28	10:32-45	11:29-30 12:50 13:32-33 17:25 18:31-34	10:1-18	Late Judean Ministry
21:33-44 26:2 26:12 26:24-32 26:36-46	12:1-11 14:8 14:21-28 14:32-42	20:9-18 22:15 22:15-37 22:39-46	12:23-35 12:7 15:13 18:11	Holy Week

Form of Jesus' Predictions

As we have seen, during the years of His public ministry Jesus often spoke of His upcoming death and resurrection. While the ultimate meaning of these prophecies was consistent, Jesus employed various styles of communication. In some instances He spoke in a straightforward manner. On other occasions He employed metaphors, Old Testament types, axioms, and a variety of other forms.

Clear Statements

On several occasions Jesus provided clear, straightforward facts relating to the events of Holy Week (Matt. 16:21; matt. 17:22-23; Matt. 20:18-19; etc.). In Matthew 17:22-23, for example, Jesus told His disciples, "The Son of Man is going to be betrayed into the hands of men. They will kill him, and on the third day he will be raised to life." By combining these verses with several other similar statements we can construct a composite prophecy.

Destroy the temple of this body and I will raise it again in three days. But before this I must go to Jerusalem to be betrayed into the hands of men. You disciples will be scattered. I must suffer many things at the hands of the elders, chief priests and teachers of the Law. They will condemn me to death and turn me over to Gentiles to be mocked, spit on, flogged, and crucified. On the third day I will be raised to life (Kessel 1984:55).

Metaphors

The Old Testament contains numerous prophecies concerning the life, death, and resurrection of the Messiah.¹ It goes without saying that Jesus was thoroughly steeped in the Old Testament.² It is therefore not surprising that, as He referred to the events of Holy Week, He often used familiar Old Testament metaphors.

The Cup. During His deepest agony in the Garden of Gethsemane, Jesus prayed, "My Father, if it is possible, may this cup be taken from me. Yet not as I will, but as you will. . . My Father, if it is not possible for this cup to be taken away unless I drink it, may your will be done" (Matt. 26:39, 42). A short time later Peter raised a sword to defend Jesus and cut off a servant's ear. "Jesus commanded Peter, 'Put your sword away! Shall I not drink the cup the Father has given me'" (John 18:11)? The metaphor "cup" is often used in the Old Testament [Is. 51:17,22; an "impending crisis in terms of a severe yet temporary outpouring of divine judgment" (Bayer 1992:631)]. It

thus makes a very fitting metaphor for Jesus' suffering and death for the sins of the world.

Baptism. In a similar fashion, Jesus used the metaphor "baptism." Shortly before Palm Sunday Jesus gave the disciples specific details about his death (Mark 10:32-34). James and John changed the subject and asked for prime positions in his glorious kingdom. Jesus replied "You don't know what you are asking. . . . Can you drink the cup I drink or be baptized with the baptism I am baptized with" (Mark 10:38)? Like cup, baptism/flood is an Old Testament metaphor for an outpouring of judgment (Ps. 32:6; 42:7; 69:2, 14-15; 124:4-5; Is. 8:7-8; 43:2). Jesus was fully aware that His inundation (baptism) in God's wrath or judgment for sin was of temporary duration (Luke 12:49-50).

The Hour. After praying in the Garden of Gethsemane Jesus approached his drowsy disciples and said "The hour has come. Look, the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners" (Mark 14:41). Soon afterward Jesus was arrested by the chief priests, temple guards, and elders. Jesus said to them, "But this is your hour—when darkness reigns" (Luke 22:53). In the Old Testament the phrase "in the same hour" frequently appears. In Daniel, for example, it clearly refers to immediate destruction (Dan. 3:6, 11, 15). Thus the three believers were, in the same hour, thrown into the fiery furnace.

The Good Shepherd. In John 10:14 Jesus claimed "I am the good shepherd; I know my sheep and my sheep know me. . . and I lay down my life for the sheep." The picture of the good shepherd was very familiar to the Jews. In the Old Testament it is connoted a caretaker of God's people. God, Himself, was known as the shepherd of Israel (Ps. 23:1; Ps. 80:1; Is. 40:10-11; Eze. 34:11-16) as opposed to false shepherds or prophets (Is. 56:9-12; Eze. 34). A good shepherd in the Old Testament was one who was willing to risk danger for the sake of the sheep (Gen. 31:39; I Sam. 17:34-37).

The Bridegroom. F. F. Bruce (1983:95) notes that in Old Testament days "the king—especially Israel's divine King—was regarded as married to his people or land" (Is. 62:4-5; Ps. 19:5). In John 3:29 John the Baptist acknowledged Jesus to be the bridegroom of the church. Later, Jesus used the metaphor to refer to His death (Matt. 9:15)

The Temple. The first recorded death and resurrection prophecy of Jesus is found in John 2:19. There Jesus told the Jews, "Destroy this temple, and I will raise it again in three days." John explains, "But the temple he had spoken of was his body" (John 2:21). The writers of the New Testament frequently referred to believers as the temple of God, indicating that God dwells

within them. “Don’t you know that you yourselves are God’s temple and that God’s Spirit lives in you” (1 Cor. 3:16, also 1 Cor. 6:19; 2 Cor. 6:16; Eph. 2:21-22; Heb. 3:6; 1 Pet. 2:5)? The metaphor itself, however predates the New Testament. The picture of the tabernacle or temple and the presence of God is pervasive in the Old Testament (Lev. 26:11-12; Eze. 37:27-28).

The Seed. In John 12:24 Jesus employed the metaphor of a wheat seed. “I tell you the truth, unless a kernel of wheat falls to the ground and dies, it remains only a single seed. But if it dies, it produces many seeds.” The picture of death and resurrection in the seed is clear.

Parables

Jesus proclaimed His upcoming death by means of parables. The first three gospel accounts record the parable of the wicked tenants (Matt. 21:33-44; Mark 12:1-11; and Luke 20:9-18). Before reviewing this parable we should first turn to Jesus’ closing remark. “Have you never read in the Scriptures: ‘The stone the builders rejected has become the capstone. . . .’” (Matt. 21:42). Here Jesus quotes from Psalm 118:22 and uses a stone as a metaphor for rejection and vindication.

Jesus spoke the parable of the wicked tenants after the Jewish religious leaders clearly rejected both the testimony of John the Baptist and the person of the Savior (Matt. 21:23-27). In a trilogy of parables, Jesus first demonstrated the insincerity of the Jewish leaders in the parable of the two sons (Matt. 21:28-32). Then He spoke the parable of the wicked tenants which exposed the rebelliousness of the Jews which would soon result in the death of God’s Son (Matt. 21:33-46). Finally, in the parable of the wedding banquet Jesus warned the Jewish leaders to turn from their evil ways lest judgment befall them. (Matt. 22:1-14).

In the middle parable a landowner planted a vineyard, rented it out to tenants, and went away. At harvest time he sent servants to the tenants to collect his fruit. The tenants seized, beat, killed, and stoned his servants. More servants were sent and they were similarly treated. At last the landowner sent his son. The tenants reasoned “ ‘This is the heir. Come, let’s kill him and take his inheritance.’ So they took him and threw him out of the vineyard and killed him” (Matt. 21:38-39).

The parable was readily understood by the Jewish religious leaders, and well it should have been. The image painted by Jesus clearly pointed back to the Old Testament. The major points of comparison are these:

Landowner = God the Father (Ps. 24:1)

the Son of Man will be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth (Matt. 12:40). Jesus also referred to the preaching of Jonah which led to repentance among the people of Nineveh. The Jewish leaders were not as receptive as Jonah's audience, for they refused to confess their sins and believe.

Moses and the Bronze Serpent. One of the most striking stories in the Old Testament is the account of Moses and the bronze serpent. The Children of Israel grumbled and complained about the food and water which God provided for them in the wilderness. Consequently God sent deadly snakes among them. Facing the fangs of death the people begged Moses to intercede for them with the Lord, which he did. God told Moses to build a bronze snake and anyone gazing intently on that snake, firmly believing in the promise of God, would live (Nu. 21:4-9). Jesus used this account to illustrate the salvation to be gained through His death. (John 3:14-15)

Martyred Prophets. In the parable of the wicked tenants, previously discussed, Jesus alluded to the suffering and death of the prophets of God at the hands of unbelievers. He used these prophets as a type of His own suffering and death. In a reply to evil Herod, Jesus suggested He would travel to Jerusalem in order to accomplish His purpose, "for surely no prophet can die outside Jerusalem" (Luke 13:33). This is the same Jesus who commented that a

general proposition. He uses it as a prophecy concerning His own death, however.

Prophetic Visit

The Old Testament states that Elijah the prophet never died. He was bodily taken up into heaven in a whirlwind (2 Kings 2:11), where he resided with both body and soul. Moses, on the other hand, died and was buried by God Himself (Deut. 34:5-6). Both Elijah and Moses were believers and both went to heaven. As Jesus was preparing for His own death He went to a mountain to pray. There He was transfigured. Peter, James, and John were eyewitnesses. "Two men, Moses and Elijah, appeared in glorious splendor, talking with Jesus. They spoke about his departure which he was about to bring to fulfillment at Jerusalem" (Luke 9:30-31). Arndt (1956:262) tries to grasp the significance of this prophetic visit. He concludes, "Jesus' own prediction of the woe which was in store for Him is followed by an extraordinary happening giving proof that in spite of the deep humiliation and bitter suffering awaiting Him, He was the Son of God, the Darling of Heaven."

Vineyard = Kingdom of God (Ps. 80:8-16; Is. 5:1-7; 27:1-7; Jer. 2:21)

Tenants = Rulers, teachers, leaders

Mistreated Servants = Old Testament prophets through John the Baptist (I Kings 18:4; 19:10; 22:24, 27; II Chron. 24:21; Jer. 20:1-2; 37:15; 38:6; Neh. 9:26; Matt. 14:10)

Son = Jesus Christ, Son of God

Clearly Jesus used this parable to denounce the Jewish leaders and to pronounce His own death. His closing remark about the stone which became the capstone foretold of His life after death and the fact that his church would rest upon His resurrection.

Types

Jonah On several occasions Jesus used the Old Testament story of Jonah as a type or shadow revealing His own death and resurrection (Matt. 12:38-40; Matt. 16:1-2; Luke 11:29-32). Jonah was swallowed by a giant fish and was in the depths of the sea for three days. Then he was vomited up on shore. In like manner Jesus would be put to death and then arise on the third day. "For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of a huge fish, so

prophet has not honor in his home town (Luke 4:24). Yet, Jesus was more than a prophet. He was "the prophet." This prophet would know the Lord face to face (Deut. 34:10) and speak with the voice of God (Deut. 18:15-19). This prophet would be none other than the Messiah. John clearly pointed away from himself to Jesus as "the prophet" (John 1:19-27).

Euphemism

On Thursday evening in Holy Week Jesus showed that He knew the future. He told the disciples that one of them would betray Him. As they questioned Him about it He seized the opportunity to speak of another future event. "The Son of Man will go just as it is written about him" (Matt. 26:24). It is significant that while Jesus used a euphemism to indicate His suffering and death, He also connected it to Old Testament prophecies which were very explicit and detailed.

Axiom

"My command is this: Love each other as I have loved you. Greater love has no one than this, that one lay down his life for his friends. You are my friends if you do what I command" (John 15:12-13). Here Jesus states a

Analysis

Thus far we have seen that the perfect life, vicarious death, and resurrection of Jesus form the heart and core of the saving Gospel message. While this gospel can be found throughout the Scriptures, Jesus' numerous prophecies concerning His own death and resurrection form a very significant source of gospel information. We now turn to an analysis of these prophecies.

The Veracity of Jesus' Prophecies. On numerous occasions Jesus predicted His death and resurrection. This is obvious to anyone who accepts the Scriptures as God's inerrant word. It is not surprising, however, that others have called these prophecies into question. Form critics view the Gospel writers as editors who took bits and pieces from oral traditions and imaginatively combine them into compelling written narratives (Blomberg 1992; Guthrie 1968:188-219). Redaction critics—following in the footsteps of their mentors, the form critics—assume that the Evangelists made alterations in their sources (Osbourne 1992). Theologians steeped in the methodologies of form and redaction criticism deny the validity of Jesus' death and resurrection prophecies. They believe that redactors/authors/editors using post-Easter knowledge wrote the prophecies back into the pre-Good Friday narratives (Bayer 1992).

While the purpose of this paper is not to concentrate on the inerrancy of Scripture, a few comments are in order. Both form and redaction critics make an *a priori* assumption which denies the existence of prophecy. Thus, they conclude that while Jesus may well have known that He was going to be put to death, He could not have known the precise details. In essence this denies the omniscience of Jesus and His deity. Moreover, such a conclusion also denies that Jesus had a working knowledge of the Scriptures and an understanding of God's plan of salvation. As we have seen even as the Old Testament supplied ample information about the Messiah's birth (Is. 7:14; Micah 5:2), so it also provided a wealth of detail about His death (Ps. 22; Is. 53), and resurrection (Ps. 16:10).

The Extent and Frequency of Jesus' Prophecies. Jesus' death and resurrection predictions covered the entire span of His public ministry. Jesus' ministry began with His baptism by John in the Jordan River. Not long thereafter Jesus fulfilled the prophecy of Malachi (3:1)—“Then suddenly the Lord you are seeking will come to his temple. . . .” Jesus not only came to the temple but cleansed it as well (John 2:12-22). When the Jews demanded a sign which would prove His authority, He responded, “Destroy this temple [His body],

and I will raise it again in three days” (John 2:19). Then throughout His ministry Jesus predicted His death and resurrection. Finally , during Holy Week Jesus repeatedly spoke of such matters. While Jesus spoke of His upcoming death and resurrection during the early part of His ministry (Early Judean Ministry and Galilean Ministry), it was after the death of John the Baptist that Jesus spoke much more frequently of such matters. This is completely consistent with the parallel between the lives of the forerunner and the Savior.

Parallels Between the Lives of John the Baptist and Jesus

The Ministry of John was Announced in the Old Testament—Mal. 3:1; Mal. 4:5

The Ministry of Jesus was Announced in the Old Testament—Mal. 3:2

The Birth of John was Announced—Luke 1:11-17

The Birth of Jesus was Announced—Luke 1:26-38

John was Born—Luke 1:57-80

Jesus was Born—Luke 2:1-20

John Began his Public Ministry—Luke 3:1-18

Jesus Began His Public Ministry—Luke 3:21-23

John was Arrested and Executed—Mark 6:14-29

Jesus was Arrested and Executed—Mark 14:43-15:41

Once Jesus heard that John had been executed, He began a series of attempted withdrawals from the public limelight (Matt. 14:13). Through prayer and instruction He wished to prepare Himself and His disciples for His death and resurrection. Part of this instruction involved providing details about the events of Holy Week (Mark 8:31-2; Mark 9:9-13; Mark 9:30-32, etc.).

Jesus’ Use of Prophetic Styles. Jesus employed various literary devices such as metaphors, parables, and historical types to reveal His death and resurrection. Why did He use this variety of communication styles? In order to answer this question we need to view the prophecies in context.

Jesus’ Prophetic Statements in Context

TEXT	PROPHECY FORM	PROPHETIC CONTENT	PRIMARY AUDIENCE
John 2:19-22	Temple Metaphor	Death, Resurrection	Jewish Leaders (unbelievers*)
John 3:14	Moses and Bronze Serpent Type	Death	Single Pharisee (unbeliever)
Matt. 9:15	Bridegroom Metaphor	Death	John’s Disciples and “Some People” (unbelievers—see Ylvisaker 1977:199)

TEXT	PROPHECY FORM	PROPHETIC CONTENT	PRIMARY AUDIENCE
Matt. 12:38-40	Jonah Type	Death	Pharisees, Teachers of the Law (unbelievers)
Matt. 16:1-4	Jonah Type	Death	Pharisees and Sadducees (unbelievers)
Matt. 16:21	Clear Statement	Suffering, Death, Resurrection	Disciples (believers)
Matt. 17:2-3	Prophetic Visit	Death, Resurrection	Disciples (believers)
Matt. 17:9-12	Clear Statement	Suffering, Death, Resurrection	Disciples (believers)
Matt. 17:22-23	Clear Statement	Suffering, Death, Resurrection	Disciples (believers)
John 10:1-18	Good Shepherd Metaphor	Death, Resurrection	Pharisees (unbelievers)
Luke 11:29-30	Jonah Type	Death	Crowd (believer, unbelievers)
Luke 12:50	Baptism Metaphor	Death	Disciples (believers—see Arndt 1956:321)
Luke 13:32-33	Martyred Prophet Type	Death	Pharisees (unclear ³)
Luke 17:25	Clear Statement	Death, Resurrection	Disciples (believers)
Matt. 20:18-19	Clear Statement, Cup Metaphor, Baptism Metaphor	Suffering, Death, Resurrection	Disciples (believers)
John 12:23-35	Seed Metaphor, Hour Metaphor, Clear Statement	Death, Resurrection	Disciples (believers)
Matt. 21:33-44	Wicked Tenants Parable	Death	Jewish Leaders (unbelievers)
Matt. 26:2	Clear Statement	Death	Disciples (believers)
Matt. 26:12	Clear Statement	Death, Burial	Disciples (believers)
Luke 22:15	Clear Statement	Suffering, Death	Disciples (believers)
Matt. 26:24-32	Euphemism, Clear Statement, Shepherd Metaphor	Death, Resurrection	Disciples (believers)
John 15:13	Axiom	Death	Disciples (believers)
Matt. 26:36-46	Cup Metaphor, Hour Metaphor	Death	Disciples (believers)
John 18:11	Cup Metaphor	Death	Disciples (believers)

*The determination of apparent "believer" or "unbeliever" is based on whether the individual (s) accepted the deity of Christ. In many cases this is possible to determine from the text. When such information was not readily available, other contextual evidence was used to make a judgment concerning the spiritual condition of the audience.

The question is, why did Jesus use different prophecy forms when speaking of His upcoming death and resurrection? We are now in a position to hazard an answer. The data presented above shows that prior to John the Baptist's death, Jesus used a variety of prophecy forms but did not issue clear statements on the subject. After John's death, however, Jesus became more direct and detailed in His prophecies. From this point on Jesus focused more and more clearly on His passive obedience and triumphant resurrection.

More significantly, the data indicate that Jesus spoke clearly to His disciples but used other prophecy styles when in the presence of unbelievers. In many respects this parallels Jesus' use of parables. Matthew 13 is a case in point. Here Jesus sat in a boat and preached to the crowd on shore. He told parables about the sower, the weeds, the mustard seed, and yeast. Jesus' disciples asked, "Why do you speak to the people in parables" (Matt. 13:10)? Jesus answer was complex (Matt. 13:11-17), yet Fahling (1946:299) summarizes it in simple terms—"The purpose of parables was both to reveal and to conceal." Fahling goes on to explain. Christ had a policy not to "cast His pearls before swine." When addressing a crowd of believers and unbelievers Jesus was prone to speak in figurative ways. Simple-minded believers, picking up on simple hints, could correctly interpret what He said and receive a blessing. Meanwhile, the meaning was hidden from those who would have tried to use His words against Him. The same conclusion can be reached about Jesus' use of figurative prophecies.

Final Thoughts

The gospel is the power of God for salvation (Rom. 1:16). It is a message of Christ's vicarious life and death and His triumphant resurrection. Those who desire to preach the gospel are encouraged to proclaim the entire message without separating its parts. Thus a gospel Christmas sermon would include not only Christ's birth but, also, the purpose for His taking on human flesh—to live, suffer, die, and rise again. Likewise, a Lenten sermon should not stop short of the resurrection. There might be a tendency for some pastors during Lent to defer speaking of Christ's resurrection in order to avoid making Easter anticlimactic, or to lop off the Easter verse of "Go to Dark Gethsemane" in order to preserve the solemn mood of Maundy Thursday. The gospel, however, should not be shortchanged for the sake of creating pathos. In this regard a study of the Lenten pericopies and hymns and Lenten sermon series might be revealing. The essential argument here is that a unit

concept of the gospel should be maintained. The gospel, made up of various parts, should be proclaimed as a unified whole.

The final application of this study concerns the use of these prophecy texts. These texts should be well represented in the pericopes. First, they tie together the Old and New Testaments. This continuity of Scripture was important to the formulators of the Nicene Creed. In the summary of Jesus' saving work they noted that on the third day Jesus "rose again according to the Scriptures" (also see 1 Cor. 15:3). Second, these death/resurrection prophecies were very important words of Jesus. As Jesus approached the time of His death, He sought opportunities to speak of such things to His faithful disciples. The issue of His death and life was of paramount importance in His teaching. Third, these prophecies are gospel, the power of God unto salvation.

Notes

¹A partial list of Messianic prophecies includes: Gen. 3:15; 12:3; 49:10; Deut. 18:15; Ps. 2:2; 16:10; 22; 45:2; 68:18; 69:21; 110:1; 118:22; 132:11; Is. 2:4; 7:14; 9:2; 7; 11:10; 25:8; 28:16; 42:1; 49:6; 52:14; 53; 55:4; 59:16; 61:1; 62:11; 63:1; Jer. 23:5; Eze. 17:22; Dan. 2:34, 44; 7:13; 9:25; Mic. 5:2; Hag. 2:7; Zec. 3:8; 6:12; 9:9; 11:12; 12:10; 13:7; Mal. 3:1. Frank Charles Thompson (1983: 1567-1570) in his Chain-Reference Bible lists various Messianic Prophecies and their fulfillment:

Offspring of a Woman—Gen. 3:15 = Gal. 4:4; Luke 2:7; Rev. 12:5

Offspring of Abraham—Gen. 18:18; Gen. 12:3 = Acts 3:25; Mat. 1:1; Luke 3:34

Offspring of Isaac—Gen. 17:19 = Mat. 1:2; Luke 3:34

Offspring of Jacob—Num. 24:17; Gen. 28:14 = Luke 3:34; Matt. 1:2

Descendant from the Tribe of Judah—Gen. 49:10 = Luke 3:33; Matt. 1:2-3

Heir to the Throne of David—Is. 9:7; Is. 11:1-5; 2 Sam. 7:13 = Matt. 1:1; Matt. 1:6

Place of Birth—Micah 5:2 = Matt. 2:1; Luke 2:4-7

Time of Birth—Dan. 9:25 = Luke 2:1-7

Born of a Virgin—Is. 7:14 = Matt. 1:18; Luke 1:26-35

Slaughter of Infants—Jer. 31:15 = Matt. 2:16-18

Escape into Egypt—Hos. 11:1 = Matt. 2:14-15

Ministry in Galilee—Is. 9:1-12 = Matt. 4:12-16

As a Prophet—Deut. 18:15 = John 6:14; John 1:45; Acts 3:19-26

As a Priest like Melchizedek—Ps. 110:4 = Heb. 6:20; Heb. 5:5-6; Heb. 7:15-17

Rejection by Jews—Is. 53:3; Ps. 2:2 = John 1:11; John 5:43; Luke 4:29; Luke 17:25

Some of His Characteristics—Is. 11:2; Ps. 45:7; Is. 11:3-4 = Luke 2:52; Luke 4:18

His Triumphant Entry—Zec. 9:9; Is. 62:11 = John 12:12-14; Matt. 21:1-11; John 12:12

Betrayed by a Friend—Ps. 41:9 = Mark 14:10; Matt. 26:124-16; Mark 14:43-45

Sold for Thirty Pieces of Silver—Zech 11:12-13 = Matt. 26:15; Matt. 27:3-10
 Money to be Returned for a Potter's Field—Zech. 11:13 = Matt. 27:3-10
 Judas' Position taken by Another—Ps. 109:7-9 = Acts 1:16-20
 False Witnesses Accuse Him—Ps. 27:12; Ps. 35:11 = Matt. 26:60-61
 Silent when Accused—Is. 53:7; Ps. 38:13-14 = Matt. 26:62-63; Matt. 27:12-14
 Struck and Spit On—Is. 60:6 = Mark 14:65; Mark 15:17; John 19:1-3; John 18:22
 Hated without Cause—Ps. 69:4; Ps. 109:3-5 = John 15:23-25
 Suffered Vicariously—Is. 53:4-6, 12 = Matt. 8:15-17; Rom. 4:25; I Cor. 15:3
 Crucified with Sinners—Is. 53:12 = Matt. 27:38; Mark 15:27-28; Luke 23:33
 Hands and Feet Pierced—Ps. 22:15; Zech. 12:10 = John 20:25-27; John 19:37
 Mocked and Insulted—Ps. 22:6-8 = Matt. 27:39-44; Mark 15:29-32
 Given Gall and Vinegar—Ps. 69:21 = John 19:29; Matt. 27:34, 48
 Hears Prophetic Words Repeated in Mockery—Ps. 22:8 = Matt. 27:43
 Prays for His Enemies—Ps. 109:4; Is. 53:12 = Luke 23:34
 His Side to be Pierced—Zech 12:10 = John 19:34
 Soldiers Cast Lots for His Clothes—Ps. 22:18 = Mark 15:24; John 19:24
 Not a Bone to be Broken—Ps. 34:20; Exod. 12:46 = John 19:33
 To be Buried with the Rich—Is. 53:9 = Matt. 27:57-60
 His Resurrection—Ps. 16:10 = Matt. 28:9; Luke 24:36-48
 His Ascension—Ps. 68:18 = Luke 24:50-51

² Stalker (1889:145-164) provides evidence for and a discussion of this issue. He cites the following passages to show how well Christ knew the Old Testament. Matt. 4:4, 7, 10; 5:17, 48; 6:29; 7:12; 8:4, 11; 9: 13; 10:15; 11:21, 24; 12:3-7, 39-42; 13:14, 15; 15:7-9; 19:8, 18-19; 21:15, 42; 22:29-45; 24:37-39; 26:30-31, 53-54; 27:46; Luke 4:15-27; 8:21; 16:29-30; 23:46; 24:27; John 5:39, 45-46; 6:32, 45, 49; 7:19, 22; 8:17, 37; 10:34-35; 13:18; 17:12, 14, 17.

³ Considerable uncertainty remains concerning the faith of these Pharisees. Ylvisaker (1977:483) concludes that they were unbelievers. Fahling (1946:461) believes they were at least friendly toward Jesus. Arndt (1956:334) And Wenzel (1986:477) leave the issue unresolved.

References Cited

Arndt, William F.

1956 Bible Commentary: The Gospel According to St. Luke. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis.

Bayer, Hans F.

1992 Predictions of Jesus' Passion and Resurrection. In Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels. Edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. Howard Marshall. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove. pages 630-633.

Blomberg, Craig L.

1992 Form Criticism. In Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels. Edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight and I Howard Marshall. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove. pages 243-250.

Bruce, F. F.

1983 The Gospel of John. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids.

Fahling, Adam

1946 The Life of Christ. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis.

Guthrie, Donald

1968 New Testament Introduction. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove.

Kessel, William B.

1984 The Life of Christ. Christ the Cornerstone Series. Evangelical Lutheran Synod. Litho Productions, Madison.

Luther, Martin

1973 Luther's Works. Vol. 28. Commentaries on I Corinthians 7, I Corinthians 15, Lectures on I Timothy. Edited by Hilton C. Oswald. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis.

Osborne, Grant R.

1992 Redaction Criticism. In Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels. Edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. Howard Marshall. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove. pages 662-669.

Stalker, James

1889 Imago Christi: The Example of Jesus Christ. Hodder & Stoughton, New York.

Thompson, Frank Charles

1983 The Thompson Chain-Reference Bible: New International Version. B. B. Kirkbride Bible Co., Inc., Indianapolis.

Wenzel, Frederick William

1986 The Wenzel Commentary: An Exegetical Study, Based on a Harmony of the Gospels. Arrow Printing, Bemidji.

Ylvisaker, Joh.

1977 The Gospels: A Synoptic Presentation of the Text in Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee.

Book Reviews:

Raj, A. R. Victor The Hindu Connection: Roots of the New Age. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House. 1995. 240 pages.

reviewed by
William B. Kessel
Bethany Lutheran College

“Oh, East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet.” Until recently this axiom by Rudyard Kipling well defined the wall separating Eastern and Western religious traditions within the past few decades, however, the ideological divider has come crashing down.

In The Hindu Connection, A. R. Victor Raj documents the connection between Hinduism and its western manifestations, the New Age Movement. He suggests that the latter is, in fact, the New Testament of Hinduism, that it is “intrinsically Hindu in its faith and practice” (p. 13). To prove his thesis he discusses how both embrace monism, pantheism, and mysticism and other beliefs. If Raj did nothing more than provide this useful comparison, his work would be of value to the Christian reader. He does not stop there, however. Raj also poses the question of how and why the New Age Movement has become so prevalent in this country. His answer to this fundamental query takes him into an analysis of the American world view with its emphasis on power and individual authority, the anti-religion philosophy of Karl Marx, deconstructionism, environmentalism, and liberal theology. As much as anything, The Hindu Connection is a resounding critique of so-called modern theology, for he indicts Schweitzer, Bultmann, and Tillich for predisposing Americans to the New Age Movement. At the same time, with keen insight, Raj digs deeply into Biblical doctrinal theology. He is neither ashamed nor timid when it comes to citing the Bible and Lutheran Confessions and proclaiming his own personal faith in Jesus Christ.

Raj, who is from India, now teaches at Concordia University in Mequon, Wisconsin. He is alarmed that much of modern mission logic and theology, although well-intentioned, plays into the hands of eastern religious thinking. Once again his critique is both profound and clear.

Having said all this, a note should be made about the level on which the book is written. The Hindu Connection, which is a volume in the Concordia Scholarship Today series, may be too advanced for the general reader. It best

serves the serious student of theology who has more than a casual knowledge of Hinduism, the New Age Movement, and theology.

When is Dialogue Between Two Dissenting Church Bodies Warranted?

Review of an article from Insights*

by J. A. Moldstad, Jr.

Ostensible Christendom, divided over differences in doctrine as evidenced by denominationalism, often has been torn between two important Biblical tenets: 1) "Make every effort to keep the unity of the Spirit through the bond of peace," Ephesians 4:3 and 2) "Watch out for those who cause divisions and put obstacles in your way that are contrary to the teaching you have learned. Keep away from them," Romans 16:17. On the one hand, Scripture never promotes the attitude of separatism (i.e., a martyr complex which sees division itself virtually as a sign of divine blessing). On the one hand, the doctrine of church fellowship is meant to be taken seriously in order to guard against the encroachment of error.

A recent article by Terry Muck entitled "The New Testament Case for Irreligious Dialogue"* supports the practice of dissenting church bodies (even non-Christian groups!) holding serious doctrinal discussions with each other. To show that the author means more than simply a sharing of confessions and creeds and includes the purpose of "mutual growth" for each of the church bodies involved, we offer this quote: "Even though it is likely that in the process of dialogue our commitments will be enriched, deepened, added to, and, sometimes, changed. . . at the end of the day it is okay, indeed normal, that our basic stances will remain."

Muck does acknowledge the warning of Col. 2:8 ff., "Beware lest anyone cheat you through philosophy and empty deceit, according to the tradition of men, according to the basic principles of the world, and not according to

* The article by Terry C. Muck appeared in the Spring, 1995, edition. Insights is a journal put out by the faculty of Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary in Austin, Texas.

Christ.” But he sees interreligious dialogues as being supported primarily by two other verses of scripture. First, he cites I Peter 3:15, where Christians are to stand ready to give reason for the hope that is within them, and —says Muck— “it is obvious from the context that such reasons are to be given in such a way that the listeners will be edified.” The second which he elicits for his cause is Paul’s remark in I Cor. 9:22, where the apostle says he was willing to become all things to all people in order to win some for the sake of Christ. Here Muck adds his own spin, “Paul was not here saying he would compromise his beliefs in order to communicate, simply that *he was willing to tailor the way he expressed his beliefs* so that he would be heard and comprehended by those who did not believe as he did.”

Is this a fair assessment of these verses? Does Scripture support an open-ended type of dialoging with religious bodies that clearly profess an adherence to teachings at odds with holy Scripture? [Muck defines *interreligious dialog* as “a sustained conversation between parties who are not saying the same thing and who recognize and respect the contradictions and mutual exclusions between their various ways of thinking.”]

In the context of I Peter 3:15 it is not the doctrine of church fellowship that is being addressed. It is the necessary *testifying* that is to be made before the heathen. Furthermore, Peter states in the next chapter, “If anyone speaks, he should do it as one speaking the very words of God” (4:11). This leaves no room for trying to solicit Peter’s support for open-ended interreligious dialog.

Paul’s remark about being all things to all people to win them for Christ dare not be turned into an attitude of indifference toward doctrine and bold confession of such. On this verse a Lutheran commentator has interjected, “It should not be necessary . . . to point out the fact that accommodating himself to the standpoint of his missionary subjects *Paul never descended to a mere pleasing of men or to connivance with their false religious notions and their sinful practices.*”

Of course, in the estimation of Muck, it is the “height of arrogance and ignorance” for Christians to think they are above entering into interreligious dialog with Muslims, Buddhists and Hindus, let alone the various divisions within Christianity itself. It is true that confessional church bodies must keep in check any “boasting” about separatism. Yet, an important question begs to be asked. What does *Scripture* identify with “arrogance?” Is it not false teaching? “If anyone teaches false doctrines and does not agree to the sound instruction of our Lord Jesus Christ and to godly teaching, he is conceited and understands nothing,” I Timothy 6:3, 4.

Reading the defense of ecumenism put forth in the Insights article should cause us as members of a conservative Lutheran synod to review again what is necessary as groundwork before two opposing church bodies sit down for serious discussion and dialog. I say, "again," because this very issue was addressed so admirably and conclusively sixty years ago in our Evangelical Lutheran Synod.

During the 1930's when our Synodical Conference partner, the Missouri Synod, began having discussions with the ALC, our ELS forefathers balked at accepting the same invitation. Why? There was a difference in the way Missouri and the ELS looked upon the kind of "dialoging" desired by the ALC. The late T. Aaberg wrote about this difference: "There was no difference between the Missouri Synod and the ELS in regard to *desirability* of a united Lutheran church, or in the requirements for such a union. The difference was that Missouri thought committee negotiations offered an opportunity to reach such a unity of doctrine and practice with the ULCA and the ALC, while the ELS did not think so" (A City Set on a Hill, p. 136)

After wrestling with this issue, our synod issued an important and definitive document, "Unity, Union, an Unionism" (simply known as the "Triple U"). It was produced on the basis of a series of Synodical Conference essays pertaining to the doctrine of church fellowship. The pamphlet was prepared for publication in 1936. It contains six theses, three of which emphasize, first of all, the need for Christians to strive for true unity in doctrine and practice. But it is the fourth point that speaks to the question before us: *When* should our own church body enter into dialog with a church body we are not in fellowship with? In answer, point 4 reads:

We hold that inter-synodical committees are useful in promoting Christian fellowship only: a) *when the various groups or synods have, through the public ministry of the Word, given each other evidence of an existing unity in the spirit, and it remains merely to establish the fact of such unity and to arrange for some public recognition and confession of the fact; b) or where it is clear that those in error sincerely want to know "the way of God more perfectly."* Acts 18:26.

