

Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

LEHRE UND WEHRE
MAGAZIN FUER EV.-LUTH. HOMILETIK
THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY-THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. XVII

February, 1946

No. 2

CONTENTS

	Page
How Dr. Martin Luther Died. Theo. Hoyer	81
Dispensationalism Examined and Found Wanting. F. E. Mayer ..	89
The Limitations of Christian Preaching. J. H. C. Fritz	94
The Developments of Home Missions in North America. F. C. Streufert	99
Homiletics	
Outlines on the Standard Epistle Lessons	115
Miscellanea	123
Theological Observer	144

Ein Prediger muss nicht allein weiden, also dass er die Schafe unterweise, wie sie rechte Christen sollen sein, sondern auch daneben den Woelfen wehren, dass sie die Schafe nicht angreifen und mit falscher Lehre verfuehren und Irrtum einfuehren.

Luther

Es ist kein Ding, das die Leute mehr bei der Kirche behaelt denn die gute Predigt. — *Apologie, Art. 24*

If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle? — *1 Cor. 14:8*

Published by the

Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis 18, Mo.

Miscellanea

An Additional Note on Acts 16:12

The statement by myself quoted in the October, 1945, number of this journal (XVI, No. 10, pp. 697—98)¹ was written as a footnote to an article on Hellenistic political institutions ("Representation and Democracy in Hellenistic Federalism," *Classical Philology*, XL [1945], 65—97. At one point it was maintained, on the basis of epigraphical evidence, that the four republics into which Macedonia was divided in 167 B. C. continued to exist under the Roman Empire. It may interest readers that this point, frequently overlooked by historians, has been given fuller treatment in the literature on the Acts of the Apostles. The technical name for one of these republics was *μερίς* ("part"). My own chief interest in Acts 16:12 was the conviction that in this passage also the word must be the technical term for one of these "parts" of Macedonia. Scholars familiar with the literature will have observed that no effort was made to cite all critical editions but merely those which contain material of special importance for the problem. Moreover, they may have noticed that I was guilty of one serious omission in overlooking A. C. Clark, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Oxford, 1933). In this edition the text of the passage and critical notes appear on p. 101 and a further discussion on pp. 362—65. This omission was particularly unfortunate, since Clark, from my point of view, has the correct interpretation of *μερίς*. His treatment of the passage, however, in other respects, too, differs radically from that of Ropes and involves several problems which, for the sake of completeness, should be noted. From the point of view of my earlier statements the result will be in part a palindrome, but, on the other hand, additional support for the interpretation of *μερίς* already given.

My discussion was written from the point of view that the best manuscript tradition is represented by Codex Vaticanus, which, according to Ropes, for the passage under consideration reads: Φιλίππους, ἧτις ἐστὶν πρώτη μερίδος τῆς Μακεδονίας πόλις, κολωνία. The approach of Clark to the problem of the relative values of the manuscripts is entirely different. It is his contention that the best evidence for the text is not to be found in Codex Vaticanus (B) and Sinaiticus and related manuscripts on which the traditional text has been based, but in a group of slightly longer manuscripts, incorrectly called "Western," of which Codex Bezae (D) is the most important. It has been held that the additional material in these manuscripts is due to interpolation. Clark, on the other hand, maintains that the shorter text has been formed from the earlier and longer text through omissions. D is written

¹ An unfortunate typographical error may be noted. In the reference to Livy near the bottom of p. 697 change XIV to XLV.

in "sense lines," and the sections omitted in the shorter version often correspond to one or more of these lines. The evaluation of the details of this argument must be left to specialists. To me, though I am not qualified to judge, Clark's position seems very strong. The shortening of a text through omissions seems more likely than its conscious expansion through interpolation. On the other hand, there are omissions also in D. In Clark's text such passages are printed between two asterisks. Material from D not included in the shorter manuscripts is printed in blacker type (cf. Clark, *op. cit.*, p. xi). For the passage under consideration D gives:

ἦτις ἐστὶν κεφαλὴ μακεδονίας
πόλις κολωνία

With this can be compared the reading of B given above. Clark's text is:

ἦτις ἐστὶν κεφαλὴ* τῆς
πρώτης μερίδος* τῆς Μακεδονίας,
πόλις κολωνία.

Here the one word derived from D, with some support from Syriac manuscripts, is κεφαλὴ. If D is regarded as an inferior manuscript, it is natural to take this as a substitute for πρώτη, as was done by me. If, however, D represents a good tradition, it should be retained. Yet, as Clark points out, also the words πρώτης μερίδος must be retained. (For πρώτης rather than πρώτη see Clark and my earlier statement.) Though the two words are omitted in D, there is sufficient evidence in other manuscripts, and, if the prototype of D was written with the division into lines shown by Clark, their omission can readily be explained on the supposition that the scribe passed from one line to the corresponding position in the next line. What, then, is the meaning of κεφαλὴ? "Capital" would be incorrect historically. Clark, however, presents sufficient evidence to prove that the word can mean "extremity," "apex," or "frontier town." If we change the last term to "frontier city" and interpret "city" (*polis*) to include not only the city proper but also its territory, then Philippi can be described correctly as a frontier city. In at least one other passage in ancient literature it is described as a city bordering on Thrace. On the south its territory reached to the sea. Neapolis, where Paul landed, was on the territory of Philippi, was the harbor town of the latter city and stood somewhat in the same relation to it as Piraeus did to Athens. Thus, though Paul landed at Neapolis, it was natural and correct to describe Philippi as a frontier city of Macedonia. Though it may seem surprising to find the account so detailed, it was equally correct to describe it as a frontier city of the first *meris* of this province. (For the relation of Neapolis to Philippi, see Paul Collart, *Philippis* [Paris, 1937], pp. 283, 493, and *passim*; for Philippi as a city bordering on Thrace, see Galen as quoted by Collart, p. 514, n. 2.)

One additional point in Clark's discussion calls for a remark, namely, the implication that the division of Macedonia into four

parts was suppressed in 148 B. C., when Macedonia was made a province, but was later restored. This seems based on the supposition that the creation of a province meant the suppression of older arrangements. A direct continuity is much more likely. Macedonia had paid taxes since 167 and had been closely watched by Rome. The establishment of a province need mean little more than that thereafter a representative of Rome—the governor—was always on hand to take over this supervision permanently. I have dealt with this point briefly in *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* (ed. T. Frank), IV (Baltimore, 1938), 303. In addition to the general impression of the policy of Rome during the period of expansion in the East (cf. M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* [Oxford, 1941], pp. 1016 f.), there is for Macedonia direct evidence that the laws of Aemilius Paulus, who had supervised the reorganization of 167 B. C., remained in force at the time of Augustus (Livy XLV, 32, 7; Justin XXXIII, 2, 7). Thus, when also the divisions of the country set up by him are found under the Empire, continuous existence must be taken for granted.

University of Chicago

J. A. O. LARSEN

Stewardship of Time

In the *Watchman-Examiner* the Rev. A. N. Meckel of Braintree, Mass., discusses the topic "Are Ministers Lazy?" Having extracted some profit from the article for ourselves, we thought it proper to pass it on to the brethren.

"I think that the average minister is lazy!" That bald statement was not made by a minister of his fellow craftsmen; it was made in the midst of a conversation by a churchwoman. She continued her indictment as follows: "One finds such mentally groomed and vocationally alert men among physicians, for instance. One admires their precision, their discipline, their sense of competence. In these respects, they seem so unlike many of our pastors."

One's first impulse is resentment—strong resentment—at such a blanket indictment of one's profession. And yet, is there a modicum of truth in it? Are ministers lazy? There was something in the words of this woman and the manner in which they were spoken that sent one away with the query of the conscience-stricken disciples of Jesus in mind: "Lord, is it I?" The writer remembers the insistent question that was asked his wife by a Boston census taker. "Yes, I understand that your husband preaches on Sunday; but what does he do during the rest of the week?" And then, of course, my brother ministers will have inwardly rankled at the statement of not a few well-meaning parishioners: "Tomorrow (Sunday) is your *busy* day, isn't it?" As though week days were vacation days.

Just recently someone mentioned a youth who was considering the Christian ministry as a life vocation for the reason that he thought it much less demanding than that of law or medicine.

Let us be frank to admit it: not a few persons consider ours a relatively comfortable calling. We are, by and large, our own bosses and can go and come much as we please. And if there is any least tendency of laziness in us, we can get by—that is, for a time! Granted, we are not thinking now of that little fringe of souls everlastingly anxious about our state of health, warning us of overwork, and wanting to send us away for a long rest. One can only pity the man who takes such counsel too much to heart.

The minister of the Gospel might well give an account of his stewardship, of the time entrusted to him for his task. Here are a few test questions he might well put to himself.

How much time does he conscientiously and deliberately give to the culture of the inner life; to prayer and communion with the source and sustenance of his being, to quiet brooding over and feeding upon the Word of Life? Surely, nine o'clock in the morning will find him in his study, with the door shut, and beginning the day with God. Wherever in the day's schedule he may have to hurry, he will bear in mind that "haste makes waste" here. We must get into spiritual focus before we can lead another in the kingdom of God. The future, at least as far as the ministry is concerned, belongs to the disciplined. "When we read the lives of the saints," says E. Herman, "we are struck by a certain large leisure which went hand in hand with a remarkable effectiveness. They were never hurried. — *They lived in God.*" (*Creative Prayer*, p. 28.) Yes, our supreme task is to know God intimately as a Friend and Companion; only so can we reveal a sense of the Presence to others.

Every morning lean thine arm a while
 Upon the window sill of heaven, and gaze upon thy God.
 Then with the vision in thy heart
 Turn strong to meet the day!

How does he husband his time with regard to the reading and assimilating of essential books and periodicals? Does the tidal movement of the best thought sweep through him? Is he oriented to the thought and movement of life of his day? Much current reading, as Nels Ferré has said, is a waste of time, is sin. And although many of us may differ as to what should come first on our "must list," nevertheless, there is an essential core of knowledge which belongs to our calling. Certainly, the ministerial mind needs to nibble constantly on something solid in the field of theology. It needs to research continually in that inexhaustible fountain of wisdom and inspiration, the Holy Bible. Good books in the philosophical sector are an aid to the stretching of flabby mental muscles. And biography—the-coming-to-know the great souls who blazed spiritual paths before us—surely that kind of reading is indispensable. If God has no use for a clerical "busy-body," neither can He profitably employ a mere "bookworm." Urbanity of mind, however, is a far different and necessary thing.

How much time does the minister conscientiously employ in pastoral counseling and visitation? Dr. R. W. Dale, of Birmingham, frankly admitted that he had no taste for pastoral work. He deliberately set himself to cultivate a sympathetic and friendly disposition. It was said of Ian Maclaren that, long after his greatest sermons were forgotten, his kindly visits and his bedtime stories, told to some little bairn that was sick, still stood out in memory. We know of a pastor who lately told his congregation that he desired to visit personally the home of every serviceman who was returning from the armed forces.

But alas for the well-meaning man who dawdles and gossips instead of visiting systematically. The last state of his congregation and church is worse than the first. It is not that it is necessary for all ministers to have set hours for counseling or even calling. It is rather that this vital sector of the total task should be carried out deliberately and systematically. Our people know instinctively whether or not, like the Great Shepherd, we go among them "doing good." Recall the beautiful words spoken by George W. Truett at the time that he refused the presidency of a college: "I have found the shepherd heart, and I am content."

It is quite likely in his preaching on the Lord's Day that a minister gives account of his stewardship. The fruitage, or the lack of a life "hid with Christ in God," of his earnest reading, of his work as pastor, will reveal themselves there. Is there a cutting edge of his message, a thrusting relevance to the needs, the sorrows, the frustrations, the joys of his people? Are his words—after the high pattern of his Master—"spirit and life"? All in all, it is a watershed experience for both pastor and congregation. Remember the apostolic pattern of preaching. Paul deliberately eschews any academic pretense, but makes the bold claim that his preaching is "in demonstration of the Spirit and with power." Aye, there is the test, and it ought to humble the heart of each and all of us. Surely, in days like these, it is no small thing to speak as "a dying man to dying men."

Was it not Arthur John Gossip who said that whenever he begins the act of ascending his pulpit on Sunday morning, it were as though a Presence met him at the pulpit stairs and put to him the question, "Are you bringing My people *your very best*?" True, we cannot always reply to that test question in the affirmative. There is an intangible tidal quality, an ebb and a flow, in the soul's hidden life, as Martineau long ago said. But at such times it is precisely the spiritually disciplined and prepared who come off the best. You have heard, of course, of the Scottish divine who was "invisible on week days and incomprehensible on Sundays." To be able to look into the face of the Lord of Life on the Lord's Day and say, "I have done my best"—that is as much as any of us can say.

The question, then, as to whether or not ministers are lazy must be answered in the deeps of every man's own heart. Regardless of the fact that he punches no time clock and does not labor

under the immediate auspices so well known to many of his congregation, there is a stewardship which he must and does render. Perhaps the far-seeing Lincoln had our calling and profession in mind when he said in effect, "You can fool some of the people some of the time, but not all of the people all of the time!" A.

Church Order and the Confession

Translator's Note: A few preliminary words on the source of the document here submitted may be of interest. The mimeographed original bears no indication of authorship. However, the circumstances under which it came into my hands bear testimony that its author is someone high in the councils of the Bavarian Lutheran Provincial Church. The circumstances are the following: I had requested the opportunity of an interview with Dr. Meiser, *Landesbischof* of Bavaria, when he next came to Ansbach. The opportunity came on the evening of August 24 when Dr. Meiser was on his way to the meeting of German Church leaders to be held at Treysa in Hesse-Cassel. We touched on many topics during the two-hour conversation, and at the end Dr. Meiser promised to send me documents relative to some of the subjects we had covered. Among the bundle of documents I received the next day was "Kirchenordnung und Bekenntnis." Its contents expands some of the ideas Dr. Meiser had presented to me as his aim in the reorganization of the Protestant Church in Germany, which was to be the purpose of the conference in Treysa. For that reason it is historically valuable in showing the stand taken by the conservative Lutheran theologians in Bavaria regarding the reorganization of the Church in Germany.

WALTER C. DAIB

A.

I. How far is the outward organization of the Church determined by its confession?

1. We understand "outward organization" to mean all legal¹ regulation of church affairs, all church "order,"² church government.

2. The essence of the Church as described in Augsb. Conf. VII lies so fully in the sphere of "spirit," "faith," and "love" that it leaves no room for legal regulations which are found in the sphere of civil righteousness (*iustitia civilis*) and therefore also in the sphere of the law, of expedience, and of common sense.

3. Nevertheless, the opinion that the Church can and dare not adopt a legal organization is mistaken, for such an opinion mistakenly separates the visible from the invisible Church and in particular fails to take into consideration the fact that God has established in the Church the *ministerium docendi evangelii et porrigendi sacramenta* (Augsb. Conf. V). The administration of this office is to proceed "orderly and honorably" (Augsb. Conf. XIV, XV, XXVIII). Above all, provision must be made that the

¹ "Legal," *rechtlich*, refers not merely to civil law, but to any rule, or regulation, imposed by a church, or congregation, upon itself for the orderly conduct of its affairs.

² "*Ordnung*" in this translation will sometimes be rendered with "order," sometimes with "government," sometimes with "organization," depending upon the context.

Gospel is preached purely and the Sacraments are administered in accordance with their institution, *i. e.*, "order" is necessary both for the office of Gospel proclamation and for the congregation in which and through which the Gospel is proclaimed.

4. Because the only purpose for all church "order" is to safeguard the function of the proclamation of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments in accordance with the confession, all order in the Church has merely an auxiliary function. An emphasis on order which takes it out of this auxiliary position is contrary to the confession, which speaks of order merely in a very loose and unemphatic way (which may be observed without sin and which are profitable unto tranquillity and good order in the Church) and always with the caution: "Consciences are not to be burdened."

5. Even though it is by divine law (*iuris divini*) that "orders" are established in and through the congregation for the safeguarding of the proclamation of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments in accordance with the confession, yet the forms which this government assumes in individual cases are not divinely authorized, but merely human (Augsb. Conf. XXVIII).

6. While no form of church government therefore has, as such, divine sanction, yet certain forms of church government can be or become erroneous. That is always the case if church orders

- a. make impossible the administration of the means of grace in accordance with the confession;
- b. are to be valid regardless of their binding relation to the task of Gospel proclamation in accordance with the confession;
- c. are instituted or administered by persons who themselves are not bound by the confession of the Church; and
- d. if the claim is made regarding such forms of church government that they must by divine right be so constituted as they are.

7. (To 6a): The Church is not bound by "orders" which make the valid administration of the means of grace impossible. In such cases the emergency powers of the Church are called into existence (*Tractatus de potestate et primatu Papae*).

8. (To 6b): Contradictory to the confession is a situation in which the "order" in a church government begins to exist for its own sake and the church government is granted unconditional power of command analogous to a civil government. (Cf. 4 and 5.)

9. (To 6c): The later development of "State Church" church government was in many cases just as incompatible with the confession as the modern arrangement of "finance sections."³ It is

³ "Finance section" evidently refers to an arrangement by which the tax-gathering offices of the State, in which the State alone controls the personnel employed, collect the dues imposed by the Church upon its members.

false doctrine to claim that the outward organization of the Church can, may, or even must provide offices which are not bound by the confession of the Church.

10. (To 6d): The claim that the outward organization of the Church must by divine right take a certain form has been advanced at various times in the Lutheran Church,

- a. as a demand for a democratic parliamentary organization of the congregation on account of the general priesthood of believers, and
- b. as a prerogative of the clergy to lead the congregations of the Church with the power of command, *i. e.*, to be a church government by divine right.

11. (To 10a): The general priesthood of believers certainly exists, also in the confession, but not as a constitutive principle of church government. A democratic parliamentary form of organization can certainly be the expedient order at times in order to safeguard the proclamation of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments in accordance with the confession, but such a form is to be rejected if it is demanded as a matter of divine right.

12. (To 10b): Every holder of the office of Gospel proclamation leads the congregation with God's Word by divine right *non vi, sed verbo*. To assign to him the leadership with power of command within the framework of the outward organization in whole or in part may at times be very expedient but dare not be demanded as a matter of divine right, since all leadership with power of command in the Church is a human arrangement.

13. (To 10b): In the same way it may be very expedient at times (and is so now) to place the leadership of the Church, with power of command within the framework of the outward organization, into the hands of certain prominent clergymen (office of bishop). But to claim such leadership as a divine prerogative for the whole clergy or for individual prominent members of the clergy is incompatible with the confession, which, incidentally, knows nothing at all concerning legally established differences in rank in the office of the Gospel ministry.

14. The confession acknowledges the function of Gospel preaching and administering of the Sacraments as the only divinely ordained office of the Church. But just as the office may by human arrangement take various forms in individual cases, so also its functions may be distributed over several offices. That is to say: In the Church only the office of Gospel proclamation exists by divine right, but it is not a divine command that there be in the church only one office.

15. Finally, we can derive from the confession a guide in procedure when the outward organization of the Church must be changed. In such a case we are not to change the outward form as much as possible, but rather transform the present organization by the removal of those things which according to par. 6 are or have become false.

II. *In which points must the differences in organization become evident in accordance with the Lutheran and Reformed confessions?*

1. The Lutheran and the Reformed Churches answer differently the question how far the outward organization of the Church is determined by its confession.

- a. For the Lutheran Church the outward organization is a human arrangement as long as its auxiliary position over against the task of Gospel proclamation is maintained. For the Reformed Church a certain form of organization, namely, the presbyterial-synodical system, is viewed as divinely authorized and therefore constitutive.
- b. In the Lutheran Church all church organizations are bound by the confession, while in the Reformed Church even the confession is subject to the doctrinal pronouncements of a regularly called synod.

2. The difference indicated in par. 1a need not always become evident immediately in the outward organization. The freedom of the Lutheran Church to establish any form of outward organization is not to be misconstrued in a legalistic way as though the Reformed form of church government could never be accepted. Indeed, at times that may be the expedient thing to do.

Yet the Lutheran Church

- a. will always retain for itself the full freedom to change and
- b. will decline or abolish individual church orders if their acceptance or retention must be viewed as agreement with the claim that such church orders are divinely authorized,

while the Reformed Church

- a. would not be likely to refrain from emphasizing the assumption that their constitutional organization is divinely authorized, and
- b. on the other hand, could not participate in those forms of church organization which, like the office of bishop, must seem to be contrary to their confession, and
- c. would never acknowledge the guiding principle indicated in A, I, par. 15.

3. The difference indicated in par. 1b need also not appear in the constitution in express terms. The provision that doctrine is not a valid sphere of legislative powers, frequently found in Lutheran church orders, is of doubtful legal value and therefore cannot be insisted upon unconditionally. Nevertheless Lutherans would undoubtedly favor such express provision, while the Reformed would certainly decline it.

III. *What do we understand Holy Scripture to say on these points?*

1. That the Lutheran Confessions deliberately mention nothing of a divinely ordained form of church government agrees entirely with Holy Scripture. The New Testament shows a very diversified picture of constitutional organization. In Corinth everything is

charismatic without ordered ministers; elsewhere elders are ordained (Acts 14:23; 20:17; 1 Pet. 5:1); again elsewhere there are bishops and deacons (Phil 1:1; 1 Tim. 3; Tit. 1 — the question of the relationship between bishops and elders need not be discussed here). In Thessalonica “presidents” are mentioned (1 Thess. 5:12). Evidently, Apostles and congregations are free to constitute their church organization as it seems most expedient to them at the time. There is in the New Testament as yet no recognizable trace of a formal organization of the church at large.

2. The decisive element which all outward organization is to serve is also in the New Testament the preaching of the Gospel. That *must* be done and dare not be hindered by other obligations, even though they are otherwise legitimate (Acts 6:2). The Apostles are witnesses, preachers of the Gospel of the resurrection (Acts 1:22; 2:32). The self-testimony of Paul (1 Tim. 2:7; 2 Tim. 1:11; Tit. 1:3) and his directions to Timothy and Titus substantiate that the main obligation is teaching (1 Tim. 4:6, 11, 13, 16; 2 Tim. 1:8, 13; 4:2-5; Tit. 2:1, 3, 8) and the appointment of teachers (2 Tim. 2:2). The most important activity of church officials is teaching (1 Tim. 5:17; 2 Tim. 2:24; Tit. 1:9). Other occasionally mentioned offices (Eph. 4:11; 1 Cor. 12:28 — if they really enumerate distinct offices) are only different aspects of the office of Gospel preaching, just as also the spiritual gifts enumerated in 1 Cor. 12:7 f. The “shepherds” — pastors — *e. g.*, feed the congregation through the Word (Acts 20:28-30; 1 Pet. 5:1-3); likewise the “presidents” (1 Thess. 5:12); and the gifts of miracle working (1 Cor. 12:9-10, 28) is a testimony in deed for the Gospel (1 Cor. 2:4 f.; 14:22; Rom. 15:19; 1 Thess. 1:5). When offices are instituted which do not directly pertain to teaching, this is done to set free the members of the teaching office for their real ministry (Acts 6:2).

3. Thus we deduce also from the New Testament that church organization serves the purpose of safeguarding the proclamation of the Gospel; that on the other hand such order is in no way set up for its own sake; that furthermore such order is necessary (1 Cor. 14:33, 40), but no particular order has been prescribed by God.

4. Binding regulations for the outward organization of the church can therefore be drawn from the New Testament as little as from the Lutheran confession. The theses developed in section A, I, from the confession are in full agreement with the norm of the New Testament.

B

Is it possible to bring together different denominations into the framework of a common church order, or must each denomination formulate its own church order independently of the other?

1. The question is not simple in meaning:

a. “Into the framework of a common church order” can mean

- aa. that a complete church fellowship (pulpit and altar fellowship) exists.
 - bb. that two independent confessional churches are joined in a certain "administrative" fellowship, or
 - cc. that one denomination accepts the outward organizational form of another without entering upon a closer connection with it.
- b. The denominations in question have also not been named, even though the method of proof will in each case differ. We take it for granted that only the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches are here meant.
2. (To 1aa): The Lutheran Church cannot share a common church order in the sense of complete church fellowship (union in any sense) with a church that interprets Scripture differently and therefore has a different confession, because its church government must be determined by its confession.
3. (To 1bb): A certain outward "administrative" fellowship between a Lutheran and a Reformed church is possible; however, with definite limitations:
- a. The administration is to be separated with respect to those affairs which directly touch the confession: confession and doctrine; the cure of souls; worship and education; church discipline; the education, examination, ordination, appointment, retirement, spiritual administration, private study, and conduct of the clergy.
 - b. With respect to financial and other outward affairs a common administration may be instituted. However, since even the most remotely outward affair can under certain circumstances touch the confession and thus be placed *in statu confessionis*, provision must be made for such cases, either by a division of the administration touching this matter (*itio in partes*) or by the right of veto given to each side.
4. (To 1cc): This question has already been answered in section A, II. The Lutheran Church can under certain circumstances take on the Reformed presbyterial-synodical form of organization, but the Reformed Church cannot take over all forms developed in the Lutheran Church (*e. g.*, the episcopal system). But even when both churches temporarily share the same form of organization, they will reveal a different attitude toward it.

C

I. *How much has the outward organization of the Lutheran, Reformed, and "Evangelical" church system in Germany been affected by the political conditions from the 16th century onward and particularly also in the 19th century?*

1. Since church government is a legal establishment in the sphere of civil righteousness (*iustitia civilis*), it was almost to be expected (and it certainly began very early) that it would be in-

fluenced by the legal establishment of its surroundings, particularly of the state, either by taking a somewhat similar form, or else by a conscious attempt to be different.

2. There was developed in the Lutheran Church the governmentally sponsored system of church government (the beginnings of which date back to pre-Reformation times). Quite naturally, the governmental order very strongly affected the Church, whose order took on a semigovernmental character. Theories were later tailored to fit the actual cases.

3. Even the Reformed provincial churches in Germany which had been led from Lutheranism to Calvinism by their prince continued with the State Church form of church government. This was somewhat in contrast to the Reformed confession, even though partly in keeping with Zwingli's ideas. Only the Reformed churches "under the cross," *i. e.*, in territories of Lutheran or Catholic princes, formulated and adopted a genuine Calvinistic presbyterial-synodical form of church government.

4. In the 19th century the transformation of German territories into independent states which more and more adopted a constitutional form of government, necessitated a change also in the ecclesiastical order. At first the princes retained their sovereignty in the church government, which was merely expanded by the addition of congregational organizations and synods. This particular form of reconstruction was influenced on the one hand by the example of the political (parliamentary) structure, on the other hand by the Reformed pattern, and for the rest by sound Lutheran considerations of expedience.

5. The origin of "United" (Evangelical) churches in the beginning of the 19th century, particularly in the Prussia of that day, was almost totally conditioned by political motives. The new united "Evangelical Church" that was projected was above all to be a unifying support of the monarchy and at the same time give Prussia the position of leadership in the envisioned German Evangelical Church. However, the example of Prussia was not followed in all German churches and hardly at all in foreign countries. On that account, quite contrary to the original intention, the claim was made that the Lutheran and the Reformed Church continue to exist within the union, in order to prevent their isolation. That completely confused the situation. Real "united" churches were formed in Baden, the Palatinate, and Nassau, as well as in parts of Hessia. Also these were politically motivated, and it is therefore significant that they are all different from one another.

6. The ever-recurring attempts to unite the German Lutheran churches failed. One reason was the narrow provincialism arising from the sovereignty of local princes over the church government. The other was a problem which defied solution, whether recognition should be granted in Old-Prussia to the (Breslau) "Lutheran Church of Old-Prussia" alone, or whether consideration ought also

be given to a putative Lutheran Church within the Old-Prussian Union.

7. When after 1918 the secular episcopacy of the princes disappeared, the German churches were for the first time in a position to create their own constitutions. Oftentimes, however, political conditions exerted an influence in so far as the constitutional church organizations were, in part at least, bound to certain electoral procedures. The new organization was, a., a first attempt and, b., in part, strongly under the influence of the political example, either imitating or consciously excluding that pattern.

8. The Lutheran churches proceeded from the given circumstances in a truly Lutheran manner (retaining the consistorial-synodical organization) and supplemented that with such measures as seemed expedient at the time, particularly the episcopacy.

9. The idea of a *Corpus Lutheranorum* made slow progress. In 1927 the German Lutheran Bishops' Conference was born and in 1929 the Low-German Lutheran Confederation.

10. The lasting importance of the church conflict⁴ since 1933 for the question of ecclesiastical order consists in the renewal of the effort on the part of the confessional Lutheran Church, fighting shoulder to shoulder with the Reformed Church, to achieve a church government that would be bound to the confession.

11. This unanimity, however, was painfully ruptured by the disagreement regarding the application to the Old-Prussian Union of the principle that a church government should be bound to a confession. The question at issue on which no agreement could be reached can be formulated in the words: Can and should Lutherans and Reformed live side by side within a single church organization as ecclesiastical and theological tendencies, or must each confession establish its own church government, bound to its confession and its own church order, and thus actually dissolve the union?

12. The confessional Lutheran churches banded together in 1936 in the Council of the German Evangelical Church, which entered into a working agreement with the Reformed Work Committee. This had been preceded by the founding of the short-lived Lutheran Branch of the German Evangelical Church (May 14, 1933) and the Agreement of the Lutheran bishops of Bavaria, Hannover, and Wuerttemberg (1935).

⁴ *Kirchenkampf*—refers to the resistance which the confessional churches of Germany offered to the attempts of the National Socialist regime to incorporate all "Evangelical" churches of Germany into one organization under the predominating influence of *Reichsbischof* Mueller and of the so-called "*Deutsche Christen*," who had accepted the Nazi ideology of "blood and race." It was a doctrinal controversy which affected the central doctrines of Protestantism, justification by faith and the person and work of Christ.

II. *What demands for the organization of the Church today flow from the change of these conditions?*

1. The following guiding principles are derived from the foregoing:

- a. According to A, I, par. 15, the *status quo* is to be the starting point;
- b. According to A, I, par. 5, the Church is free to change the *status quo* in accordance with the present obligations of the Church;
- c. Yet the limitations mentioned in A, I, par. 6, must be observed;
- d. Also a difficulty must be taken into consideration: The ecclesiastical lawgiver certainly has a great deal of freedom in formulating the organization of the Church, but he is by no means sovereign. He is bound by the divinely imposed obligation of the Church and can therefore not work without restriction. Furthermore, he must find a way of expressing this situation in the church constitution, even though it cannot be set down in so many words.

2. The historically developed Lutheran provincial churches and their present form of organization (episcopacy, consistorial administrative boards, synods, and congregational organizations), which by and large has met the test of time, ought to be retained and developed organically.

3. (To 1b): Some individual details will need improvement and development, as the amalgamation of too small churches into a Church of the most efficient size for administration (which may lie somewhere between one half to three million members); a different arrangement and combination of synods and congregational organizations (possibly partly by election, partly by appointment), etc.

4. (To 1c): Everything contrary to the confession must be removed, as the finance-sections which are independent of the confession, or the presidential system in Thuringia,⁵ etc.

5. It is recommended that "indications" pointing toward the situation described in par. 1d be included. "Indication" in its meaning here is a constitutional provision which describes a principle or limitation, without claiming, however, that the principle (limitation) is made legally effective by the provision or that the principle (limitation) demands the particular formulation found in the provision.

⁵ A search in the reference room of the New York Public Library fails to reveal the exact nature of the objection to the presidential office in the Thuringian church government. From the context one may hazard the guess that the president of the Thuringian Church is either appointed by an agency of the State or solely responsible to it.

6. A particularly desirable "indication" according to Lutheran attitudes would point to the supremacy of the confession over all forms of outward organization. That could be accomplished by the sentence "Doctrine is not a valid sphere of legislative powers" (cf. A, II, par. 3). It would be of doubtful legal value, but certainly significant as an "indication."

7. "Indications" pointing to the limitations which the Lutheran confession imposes on all ecclesiastical order (A, I, par. 7-8) are also urgently desired. Thus some provision in the disciplinary regulations ought to indicate that a pastor may also be required by his ordination vow to protect his congregation from possible heretical measures of the church government. Particularly this limitation cannot be exhaustively stated in a legal formula. Only an "indication" is possible, but it is certainly desirable.

8. Likewise, to counteract a renewed (parliamentary) overemphasis of the supposed "congregational principle," it would be desirable to have "indications" pointing to the independence of the minister from the congregational organizations in the exercise of his spiritual functions, etc.

9. But "indications" are also desirable to counteract a certain overemphasis on the rights of the ministry. Such "indications" are, e. g., the congregations' right to call their own minister, which is provided for in so many church orders of the Reformation century; the participation of laymen in the administration of congregations and the church (as deputy chairman of the congregational organization), etc.

10. Above all, the Lutheran provincial churches are to be united into the Lutheran Church of Germany. The church provinces of the Evangelical Church of the Old-Prussian Union ought to be free to join the Lutheran Church after the fission of their Reformed congregations. On the other hand, they may prefer to join a German "United" (unierte) Church, in case it is formed.

11. The Lutheran Church of Germany could enter into an "administrative fellowship" (cf. B, par. 3) with the German Reformed Church which is in process of formation and a possible German United Church. The following changes would have to be made in the present constitution of the German Evangelical Church (D. E. K.): The *Reichsbischof* and his cabinet would be replaced by the presiding bishop of the Lutheran Church, the moderator of the Reformed Synod, and the president of the "United" Church. Each of the three church leaders would have his own headquarters offices obligated to its confession. This headquarters would deal separately with all questions which immediately touch the confession. However, representation toward the outside could be centralized, and it might be possible to arrange for joint sessions of the three denominational sectors of the headquarters offices. Financial and similar business could be transacted by a common headquarters, but the personnel would

likewise be obligated to the confession of their individual church. When desired by either of the three church leaders, also here the administration must be separated into its component parts (*itio in partes*). It would be a simple matter to reconstruct the German Evangelical Church in this manner, so that also here the principle enunciated in A, I, par. 15, would be observed.

12. An agreement between the three churches would regulate the manner in which isolated members of the Reformed (and "United") Church living within Lutheran congregations could be served so that they might participate as guests in the life of the congregation without impairing the confessional character of the congregation.

13. In case there are in one locality Lutheran and Reformed (and "United") congregations, they could apply par. 11 judiciously to the raising of funds for church purposes and to representation toward the outside and thus become united in an administrative alliance.

Some Information on Developments in Germany

Article printed in *Muenchener Zeitung* (American-sponsored), by Friedrich Meinecke, anti-Hitler, removed from *Historische Zeitschrift* editorship; submitted by Prof. Hans Rothfels, visiting professor at Brown University.

This is the voice of one of the innumerable people who today have lost their homes and all their belongings and are without knowledge of the fate that has befallen those nearest and dearest to them. They may be dispersed all over the country, while we are living in the most wretched quarters, struggling for mere existence. Yet I am calling for self-examination, and I hope that this call may possibly give some consolation and new courage to my suffering fellow countrymen. I write in the paper sponsored by our masters of today. May I do so without being suspected of delivering ordered work? Most definitely it is my own impulse and conscience which drive me, a man of high age and without fear of men.

In the spring of 1933 I was the last who warned publicly against Hitler. This was two days before the Reichstag fire. Then terror descended upon us and henceforth condemned those to silence who had seen from the very start in Hitler's achievements, dazzling though they appeared at first sight, something satanic and antagonistic to the spirit of Christian and Western civilization. This silence has been often misunderstood abroad and interpreted as a mere lack of courage. But in fact we were overwhelmed by a system of terror, inescapable and exercised with an ingenuity that has no parallel in history. It was characterized by two main features: First, it could be defied only if you were ready to become a martyr, not only for yourself but also to sacrifice your whole family. Second, the broad popular effect depended on the close interaction of this paralyzing terror with a propaganda that in-

filtrated into the masses and worked deceptively upon spiritual and even ideal needs.

Neither terror alone nor propaganda alone would have had the full effect. But closely interlocked with one another, they deluded the masses. A magnificent window dressing offering fine articles, worth their price, attracted the customer who had no knowledge of the dark and sinister background. Thus there originated among us a perverted "idealism," poisoned down to the very roots, and yet one to which many an otherwise honest soul succumbed. In addition, there was the great mass of cold and cynical opportunists and the even greater mass of those, particularly of young people, who for the sake of merely living and existing felt it inevitable to adapt themselves to the party.

This proved disastrous for the fate of all of us. For in this way throughout the nation the forces were paralyzed which could have led to purification and salvation. It is humiliating enough that it took a lost war to break the spell of the party.

One may ask me why I speak of our own omissions and weaknesses only instead of pointing to what the victorious powers of Versailles did to us. My answer to this is that in the total balance sheet of the Third Reich this aspect of the problem also would need exact consideration. But today it seems to me urgent that we examine ourselves and do our own housecleaning. One fact at any rate has to be acknowledged: With the Munich agreement of 1936 the victorious powers gave Hitler once more an opportunity to show a statesmanlike moderation in the time to come, to consolidate quietly the "successes" of his daring seizures and to preserve the peace of the world. But his demon drove him to perdition. By breaking the Munich agreement and marching into Prague in the spring of 1939 he showed that he knew of no limits in his expansionist drive, that he could not be expected to keep any treaty. Further concession on the part of his opponents had become impossible.

To those who saw more clearly it was apparent from the very beginning of the Third Reich that the mentality of Hitler and his party was bound to lead to war. And at an early moment the dark foreboding dawned in our mind that such a war, provoked in the most unfortunate constellation of the world, would end in a disastrous defeat. Only one thing did we not anticipate—that the party would succeed in exploiting Germany for their own sake by bleeding her white in a tremendous effort of almost six years.

Since the fall of Stalingrad and Eisenhower's landing in Africa it was perfectly clear that we could only prolong but not win the war. A government with a sense of responsibility would then have been in a position to conclude the peace in order to prevent a further and fatal bleeding of Germany. But for a man like Hitler and his party there was no such possibility of reaching peace. Who could have any trust in his loyalty to treaties? Thus there arose the terrible situation that we could not help seeing our cities destroyed

and millions of combatant and non-combatant fellow countrymen sent to death merely in order to prolong the lifetime of a party which was doomed to perish anyway.

All now depends on our life turning to its innermost springs. How many of the younger generation, when alone with me, have confessed in all these years that they longed for such a turn, for sincerity, truth, and inner cleanliness. Yes, there is still a young generation in Germany upon which we can set our hopes. They will feel at home again in our churches, and not only for the purpose of listening there to Bach and Beethoven. They want to go back to all the shrines of our nobler past, to Kant and Goethe, to Duerer and Thoma. Manifold are the ways by which the divine and eternal can be brought back into our lives. And precisely the German mind has helped to pave these ways, in all their variety, for the occidental world. Let us try anew! Perhaps our mission for the Christian occident has not yet ended! *

Roman Catholic and Lutheran Welfare

In the *Lutheran* of October 31 Prof. E. Theodore Bachmann of Chicago Lutheran Seminary presents a comparison bearing the title which we have prefixed. His remarks will be read with interest.

"Amid many secular ways of living, there is a Christian way of life. There is also a Christian way of serving life's needs through works of charity to which Christians are obligated. On the anniversary of the Reformation, it may be fruitful to compare the welfare work done by Roman Catholics with that done by Lutherans.

"Such a comparison might be made quantitatively. America has more than 23,000,000 Catholics, and more than 5,000,000 Lutherans. Both groups have a sense of obligation toward their own people, assisting them on the frontiers of youth, old age, illness, poverty. In child care Catholics do proportionately half again as much as Lutherans, while in caring for the aged the extent of their respective services is about the same. But in hospital work Catholics do proportionately four times as much as Lutherans. The number of full-time workers in Catholic welfare far exceeds that among Lutherans. There are, for example, 133,000 Catholic sisters, two out of five of whom are in charitable work; while we Lutherans have less than 500 deaconesses in America.

"Another comparison may be made in patterns of service. By virtue of a European state-church heritage and a protracted immigrant status in America, both Lutherans and Catholics generally have favored institutional care. In this they differ from

* NOTE.—The above article is submitted not because it is satisfactory or adequate from the religious point of view, but because it contains valuable information on developments in Germany, inclusive of the religious sphere, since 1933.—EDITOR.

American Protestantism, which has come to favor non-sectarian private agencies coupled with public welfare programs and community responsibility. In contrast to Catholics, Lutherans are organized in smaller units; smaller parishes, smaller agencies and institutions, and a lower per capita support of church-related welfare services.

"Behind statistics and patterns of service lie two major organizational developments, the National Lutheran Council and the National Catholic Welfare Conference. Both organizations are proportionately influential in their respective constituencies. Both are products of the first World War. Both help to guide and co-ordinate their assumed social task, the Lutherans through their Division of Welfare of the National Council, and the Catholics through the Department of Social Action of the National Conference.

"In Catholic circles each bishop is responsible for the development of 'the same systematic organization for the work of charity that has been vital in making effective the sacramental and educational mission of the Church.' Such charity is the expression of Christian duty as catechetically formulated and taught in the seven corporal works of mercy (based on Matthew 25:35-36). Catholic welfare work in its present extent is the outcome of many spontaneously undertaken services. It is the expression of faith and works, mixed with the very human desire for reward. If it is successfully integrated into the diocesan organization, it becomes related to the national and eventually the worldwide pattern of hierarchical organization.

"Among Lutherans the responsibility for welfare work has been variously expressed. In the age of the Reformation such welfare work as Lutherans supported was generally community-conscious; a fact which is still evident in German and Scandinavian Lutheranism. But in America Lutherans have been a long time in finding their proper place in the community, in relating their free enterprises in welfare work to the basic evangelical task of the church, and in finding a satisfactory relationship with other Lutheran private and public agencies.

"General church bodies, like the Norwegian or American Lutheran, may assume ownership and responsibility for the church's major hospitals, children's and other agencies, and thus administer an ecclesiastical welfare program through a central Board of Charities. At the other extreme is the Missouri Synod's decentralized free enterprise, which has resulted in the banding together of its agencies into the Associated Lutheran Charities. The Augustana Synod practices a conference-wide ownership and administration of its agencies. The United Lutheran Church has a medley of patterns, ranging from independent to synodically supported and controlled agencies. One of the tasks of the Division of Welfare of the National Lutheran Council is that of co-ordinating most of this complex array.

"In terms of resources, Lutherans believe they have a theo-

logical heritage superior to that of the Roman Catholics. Therein lies the Christo-centric message of the Reformation. But what Lutherans in general have lacked — at least in America — is a basic theory for relating their evangelical faith to effective action in society. Lutherans need a philosophy of welfare work. That means prayer and study.

“Lutherans have few places for training the wide variety of workers needed in the welfare field. They have no school of social work, while Catholics support nine, of which six are nationally accredited. Lutherans in America, in contrast with their brethren in Europe, have too often looked only upon the ministry as the one possibility for full-time Christian service. Can they reconcile their multiplicity of seminaries with their deficiency in other schools or programs of training for service? Nor should Lutherans think of guiding workers merely into church agencies. The mission of Lutheranism to the whole of society calls for enlightened and devout workers in many private and public agencies. How can we make this contribution effectively?

Because of the abiding challenge of Catholicism, Lutherans must realize that the Counter-Reformation is still a relentless movement. This is true in America today. It is even truer in Germany, caught in the throes of war’s terrible aftermath. In this international situation Catholics are united by a consciousness of purpose which puts Lutherans to shame. A comparison of Catholic and Lutheran welfare work is ultimately a challenge of our devotion to Christ and of our readiness to bring the life-giving gospel to His needy members, not only in word but in deed.” A.

Negro Education

Selective Service findings on educational standards reveal significant facts about opportunities afforded Negroes. Results of tests show conclusively that: 1) Illiteracy is much higher in the South than in other parts of the country; 2) Negroes, long disadvantaged in educational facilities and services, showed a much higher relative amount of illiteracy in sections where separate schools prevailed than in other sections. During the period from December 7, 1941, to December 5, 1942, it was found that 32 per cent of the 744,000 physically fit registrants without dependents, 18 to 38 years of age, who had less than five years of schooling, were Negroes. A report of the Director of Selective Service states:

“The high rate for educational deficiency remains one of the unsolved problems among Negro registrants. The four months’ study made during the summer and early fall of 1941 indicated that the rejection rate among Negroes was five times that among white registrants. In the section of the country where the largest number of illiterates is found, educational systems for whites and Negroes are separate.”

To appreciate these findings, it should be remembered that one out of every ten Americans is a Negro and that 77 per cent of our Negro population resides in the South. In eleven States south of the Mason-Dixon Line the average public-school expenditure per white pupil during the 1941—42 school year was \$68.04. The average per Negro pupil was \$26.59. A survey of non-State schools, were it made, would reveal similar inequality. The cultural, economic, and social development of Negroes—as well as their religious welfare—is hampered by such discrimination.

From *America* (R. C.)

Addendum

The following references are to be added to the article "Acts of Paul and Thecla" in the January issue of *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, pp. 55—62.

1. *Anglican Theological Review*, 1925—6, pp. 331—344: "Paul and Thecla," David F. Davies.

2. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, 1886, Volume VIII, pp. 355, 487—492.

3. *A Hellenistic Reader*, E. C. Colwell and J. R. Mantey, 1942, pp. 106—112.

4. *In the Steps of Paul*, H. V. Morton, 1944.

5. *The New Archaeological Discoveries*, C. M. Cobern, pp. 236 to 238.

6. *The New Testament Apocryphal Writings*, J. Orr, 1923, pp. xxi—xxiii, 78—98.

7. *Realencyklopaedie fuer protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, Volume I.

