

Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

LEHRE UND WEHRE

MAGAZIN FUER EV.-LUTH. HOMILETIK

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY-THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. IX

February, 1938

No. 2

CONTENTS

	Page
The Pastor's Professional Bible-Study. Th. Laetsch	81
"Von der babylonischen Gefangenschaft bis auf Christum." P. E. Kreitzmann	89
The Import and Content of Luther's Exegetical Lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews. Walter E. Buszin	100
The Doctrine of Justification According to Thomas Aquinas. Theo. Dierks	114
Sermon Study on 1 John 2:12-17.	123
Miscellanea	134
Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches	138
Book Review. — Literatur	150

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

Luther

Es ist kein Ding, das die Leute mehr bei der Kirche behält 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 for the
Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States
CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.



ARCHIVE

Miscellanea

Late News in Archeology

London and Oxford correspondents have reported on the progress of the Egypt Exploration Society's work in Nubia (see *C. T. M.*, May, 1937, p. 391). Actual excavations were begun at Sesebi, November 1, 1936, and they ended, sooner than expected, on February 17, 1937. The whole of the New Kingdom cemetery has been cleared, mapped, and recorded together with the temple area and a considerable portion of the town site between the four gates. In the foundations below the central temple was found a crypt with walls adorned by eighteenth-dynasty reliefs, showing Amenophis IV seated in the company of various Egyptian divinities. An interesting stone structure was unearthed beyond the temple area proper. This building, once reconstructed, resembles the "sun temple" excavated by Professor Garstang at Meroe in 1911. The cemetery and Nubian houses at Sesebi have yielded a goodly collection of scarabs, pottery, *faience* pendants, and numerous articles of Egyptian domestic use. Many of these are objects of artistic and definite archeological value, in all a not unprofitable short season's work.

Two well-known German scholars were lost to Egyptology and papyrology with the deaths of Prof. Adolf Erman and Prof. Adolf Deissmann in June and April of 1937, respectively.

Adolf Erman is eulogized by Egyptian archeologists as the greatest scholar in modern Egyptology. It was he who gave Egyptian philology its form and direction, which, resulted in a greatly improved understanding of the texts. Erman, though born in Berlin, was of the Swiss family Ermatinger, which migrated from Geneva in the early 18th century. His interest in things Egyptian was aroused by Prof. Georg Ebers in Leipzig, who pioneered the then new field especially through his fascinating "archeological" novels, such as his *Princess of Egypt*.

Dr. Walter Ewing Crum, Erman's oldest English friend, says of the great Egyptologist: "During the sixty years following 1875 (when Erman was twenty-one years old) not one passed unmarked by some notable book or article, almost three hundred in all, from his pen. . . . The most notable of Erman's investigations, that which gave a new orientation to the entire subject, was his demonstration of a primitive relationship between Egyptian and Semitic languages. His predecessors had often recognized identity between individual roots; it was left to Erman to work out a systematic comparison, not alone in the vocabularies, but also in significant features of morphology and grammar. . . . Erman was the first to insist on an adequate knowledge of Coptic as an essential preliminary to the study of hieroglyphics." (*Journal of Egyptian Archeology*, XXIII, p. 81.)

In connection with these remarks by Dr. Crum we note that the University of Oxford conferred the degree of D. Litt. h. c. on Dr. Crum on April 29, 1937. With a playful philological touch, which, as we are

told, is expected on these otherwise austere British occasions, the Public Orator in the course of his presentation described Crum's achievements as "ἐν τοῖς Κοπτικοῖς ἀεὶ προκόπτων" (always advancing in Coptic studies).

Dr. Deissmann was primarily a theologian rather than a papyrologist; but papyrology has indeed greatly profited by the power of his stimulating labors. His *Licht vom Osten*, found on the shelves on many of our pastors' libraries, in which he kept abreast of the progress of discovery in succeeding editions, "was in its way an epoch-making work," writes Dr. H. Idris Bell Keeper of Manuscripts in the British Museum. Deissmann was first and foremost an intermediary between the papyri and particularly New Testament studies. He was the protagonist in the school of New Testament scholars who maintained that the language of the New Testament was no peculiar diction produced by translating Aramaic modes of thought into Greek speech, but simply the colloquial *κοινή* of daily life as opposed to the artificial literary *κοινή* of contemporary pagan authors. It is true, he tended to exaggerate this view (cp. also his forced distinction between "letters" and "epistles" in St. Paul's writings); but this did not destroy the fundamental justice of his general point of view.

Manuscript students will look forward to the impending publication at the end of 1937 of the third volume of the *Catalog of Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, Manchester. Like the first volume it will contain only literary and theological texts. The texts will number nearly a hundred and are grouped as follows: 1) Theological texts (Greek); 2) Latin literary and juristic texts; 3) new classical fragments (Greek); 4) scientific and technical texts; 5) fragments of extant Greek authors.

Volume I of *Papyri Merton*, documents edited by H. I. Bell and C. H. Roberts, and selected from the collection of Mr. Wilfred Merton, should be off the press at the time of this writing. It contains fifty texts, two literary (Homer), one Biblical, and divers letters ranging in date from the third century B. C. to the Arab period.

The University of Michigan has published two new volumes known as *P. Mich. III* and *P. Mich. IV*. (*P. Mich. I* is the volume of Zenon papyri; *P. Mich. II* brought the current enumeration of texts to No. 128. Nos. 129 and 130 appeared in Prof. C. Bonner's *A Papyrus Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas*.) *P. Mich. III* covers texts numbered 131—221, and Nos. 223 to 225 appear in *P. Mich. IV*. Papyrus No. 222, it is recalled, is the codex of Pauline epistles, previously published by Prof. H. A. Sanders as *A Third-century Codex of the Epistles of Paul*. R. T. DU BRAU

The Blessed Sacrament Explained to Barbara

Under this caption, in *America* of July 24, 1937, a Jesuit, Leonard Feener, explains the mystery of the Sacrament to Barbara, "nine years old, going on ten." Our readers will appreciate a few excerpts. Barbara opens the conversation: "Father, in order to be a priest, you have to know a lot about bread, don't you? I mean if bread becomes the blessed Sacrament." "Come to think of it, Barbara, you really do. You have to know a lot about bread if you're a priest. Not about preparing it or

mixing the flour or baking it. That can be left to the nice Sisters who have charge of the hosts which are to be used in the Holy Sacrifice. But about bread as a *thing*, about what it is and what it can become when our Lord asks it to, you really have to know a lot." . . . "In the Mass, where does the bread go when you say, 'This is My body'?" "Where does it go? It doesn't go any place. It just ceases to be. It just vanishes. It just drops out of existence. . . . There isn't anything it could do—is there?—that would please it more than to give God its color, its shape, its taste, all its delicate little structure, to be used for the vesture of His most beautiful body?"

The Father then tells Barbara about a host that he found broken after it was offered and hence could not give "something which our Lord's body wanted to borrow from it," namely, "roundness and whiteness." Barbara asks, "What did you do with it then?" "I dissolved it and dropped it down a little secret hiding-place we have under the sacristy, called the *sacrarium*." "Is that where all the little hosts go that don't become our Lord's body?" "Exactly." "Do you think they feel sorry?" "If they could feel sorry, they'd be so sorry you could never console them." "I hate to think of them buried under the church." "I do, too. But it's best to forget them. They're really happy in their own way. They did the best they could. They were ready to give God all their little qualities to use in His blessed Eucharist if He had wanted them. And that's something to have been bread for, isn't it, Barbara?" "Yes, it is." "Well, what next?" "Does the little bread make any struggle about leaving its appearances when you say, 'This is My body'?" "No, it obeys promptly. . . . But the wine that becomes our Lord's blood makes a little bit of a struggle." "Does it?" "Well, you wouldn't really call it a struggle because it is all unconscious of what is happening. But you have to talk to it more strictly than you do to the bread." "Do you?" "Yes. You have to give it a little sermon and let it know that something great is being done to it, that the Old Testament is being completed in the New, and that this new substance to which it is lending all its fragrance and sweetness and taste and color is the blood of Jesus, which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins." "Why do you suppose it takes longer to consecrate the wine into the Lord's blood than it does to consecrate the bread into our Lord's body?" "Well, it wouldn't take a second longer if God wanted to insist. But wine, you know, is a very fastidious substance. It is nearest to a living thing of any non-living thing we know. It has an individuality (no two wines are the same), and when you bottle wine, you always put the date on the bottle. It even seems to be sensitive about its age. And so God, in His nice way, sort of respects it at the consecration and in asking it to give up its taste and odor and pungency so that they can be used by His precious blood in the Eucharist gives it, so to speak, a little sermon, so that it will have been respected in a reverential and holy way. God, you know, has a marvelous respect for every creature He has made, even for those things which have no minds and can't think. Because He uses them, He blesses them and makes them holy, as He did, through the priest, the water with which you were baptized." "The

host looks the same after the consecration as it does before, doesn't it, Father?" "Exactly the same." "But the bread is no longer there?" "No, God takes the lookness right off the bread and uses it for His own lookness. . . . The reason God takes the lookness and the whiteness and the tasteness of the bread is so that you can eat Him." "Couldn't I eat Him otherwise?" "Of course not." . . . "Wouldn't you rather see Him than eat Him?" "I'd really like to do both. But if I had my choice, honestly, and had to take one or the other, I'd rather receive Him in Holy Communion than listen to His voice in a thousand sermons, however beautiful they may be, because sermons are, after all, only His words and sights of Him only His images in our eyes; but the blessed Sacrament is Himself united to us as food. You can't get any closer to Him than that." . . . "Isn't it lovely of the little bread to give our Lord's body all its whiteness, its taste, its smallness, so we can receive Him in the blessed Sacrament?" "Barbara, it is not only lovely of it, it is perfectly darling of it." "Good-by!" "Good-by!"

Indeed, "you have to know a lot about bread if you're a priest." Incidentally, Barbara's Father apparently knows more about wines than about the Scriptural doctrine of the Sacrament, and his coining of new words is on a par with his knowledge of what happens to bread and wine in the Sacrament. Both are counterfeits! T. L.

Ein kurzes Gutachten vom heiligen Abendmahl

„Teurer Herr Pastor!

„Soeben fällt mir ein, daß wir, als wir bei Gelegenheit der Konferenz in Lake Creek über die Stelle 1 Kor. 11, 26 sprachen, unterbrochen wurden. Ich wollte damals sagen: Wenn der Apostel an der bezeichneten Stelle nur hätte sagen wollen, daß der, welcher das Sakrament genießt, des Herrn Tod verkündigen soll, so hätte er schreiben müssen *ὄρε* oder *ὄσοι ἐσθίετε*. Nun schreibt er aber *ὄσάκις* und drückt damit aus, daß er einen wiederholten Genuß des Sakraments voraussetze. Dazu kommt aber, daß er dies *ὄσάκις* zu einer Zeit schrieb, da die Christen alle Sonntage das heilige Abendmahl feierten, und es liegt somit in dem *ὄσάκις* eine Gutheißung der häufigen Genießung des Sakraments und ein Beweis, daß diejenigen die Leute übel beraten, welche ihnen sagen, man solle nicht so oft kommen, denn dadurch werde der Sakramentsgenuß zur Gewohnheitsache. St. Paulus hat nicht so gerathen.

„Mit herzlichem Gruß

„St. Louis, den 13. Januar 1894

Hr. A. L. Gräbner“

