Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

LEHRE UND WEHRE

MAGAZIN FUER EV.-LUTH. HOMILETIK

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY-THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. XVI December, 1945 No.12

CONTENTS

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 for the

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

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis 18, Mo.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

condemns God as not conforming to man's sense of equity. (See September issue, pp. 605 ff.) How shall we escape these "horrible, perilous offenses"? Let faith rule, the faith which abstains from investigating and harmonizing and leaves the matter to God.

And we will desist from these curious, evil investigations the more readily as God has assured us that He will solve the difficulty for us in His own good time (1 Cor. 13:12)! "Was darueber ist, wird uns unser Seligmacher Christus im ewigen Leben selbst offenbaren." We read in the *Proceedings of the Eastern District,* 1876, p. 30: "Why so many do not hear the Gospel and as a result thereof do not believe, is a great, unfathomable mystery. Let the world heap scorn upon us Christians on that account and blaspheme God. The day is coming when all shall see that God, in spite of the perdition of so many souls, still is the eternal love." (See also *Proceedings Northern District,* 1876, p. 29.) Faith can afford to wait. And it is of the nature of faith to wait for the Lord.

Our present discussion may be summed up in the words with which Dr. Stoeckhardt concludes his study of 1 Peter 3:19 f.: "Everything now depends on what the sinners do here on earth about Christ. That determines their eternal fate. Here one might ask: But how about those who have heard nothing of Christ? And why is it that all did not hear? Why has God not given His Word at all times at all places? These questions touch upon a domain which is utterly closed and hidden to us. Here begin the mysteries of God, into which we cannot and should not search. Scripture confines our thinking to the state of affairs produced by the Gospel, the offer of salvation through Christ. Our sole business is to carry out Christ's command and preach the Gospel to every creature, to testify to all that without Christ there is no salvation, that he that believes on Christ is saved, but he that believeth not will be damned." The question is not: Has God done His duty toward the heathen? The question is: Are we doing our duty? With that, faith concerns itself. Doing that, it rests content.

TH. ENGELDER

The Lord's Prayer, the Pastor's Prayer

The Conclusion

Matthew 6:13: Ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.

First we treat this conclusion as a doxology. It is numbered among the noteworthy rejected readings. We agree that it is a reading; we acknowledge that it is a noteworthy reading; we

regret that it is a rejected noteworthy reading. Who rejected it? Griesbach, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth, the majority of editors. Why? "The principle argument rests on its absence from four of the oldest uncials (ℵ B D Z) and five cursive MSS., from the Latin and Coptic versions, and from the citations of the Latin Fathers" (*The Bible Commentary,* F. C. Cook, Ed.). *The Expositor's Greek Testament* states as textual criticism: "The doxology οτι σου . . . αμην is wanting in ℵ B D Z and is regarded by most modern critics as an ancient liturgical assertion." The expositor then makes the following successive leaps: ". . . a liturgical ending, no part of the original prayer, and tending to turn a religious reality into a devotional form." In the "Introduction Concerning the Three Gospels" the same author suggests five canons to be relied on legitimately for the attestation of authenticity. His third canon reads as follows: "Sayings found only in a single Gospel may be accepted as authentic when they sympathize with and form a natural complement to other well-attested sayings." His fourth canon reads: "All sayings possess intrinsic credibility which suit the general historic situation." In a later paragraph the author asks: "Is the Lord's Prayer the Lord's at whatever time given to His disciples?" All this seems confusing. The *Catholic Encyclopedia* leaps thus: "The doxology 'for Thine is the kingdom,' etc., which appears in the Greek *textus receptus* and has been adopted in the later editions of the *Book of Common Prayer,* is undoubtedly an interpolation." *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia* states: "The oldest form of the doxology, as would appear from the *Didache,* omits 'the kingdom' and 'Amen.' The 'Amen' probably did not appear in the original text of Matthew and Luke. At an early period, however, it was imported into the Christian literature from the synagog prayers." *The Commentary on the Holy Bible* (Dummelow, Ed.) remarks: "The R. V. rightly omits the Doxology, which is a liturgical addition, dating, however, from an early age, for it is found in *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (circa 80—160 A. D., but probably before 100). It is Jewish in origin." The *Bible Commentary,* however, adds to the statement quoted above that the doxology "is found with occasional variations in nine uncials and at least 150 cursives." *Clark's Commentary* has the following note on this doxology: "ancient, in use among the Jews, should not be left out of text merely because some MSS. have omitted it, and it has been variously written in others." The *International Critical Commentary* writes: "Its insertion seems to be due to the liturgical use of the Lord's Prayer, and the early forms of it vary. k has: *'quoniam est tibi virtus in saecula saeculorum';* S2: 'because Thine is the kingdom and the glory forever and ever, Amen.'" I was not able to find any

reference to the authenticity of the Doxology as doubtful in the centuries before Bengel and Griesbach. The older Lutheran theologians seem to have seen no reason to treat it as an interpolation. Luther expounds this text in his treatise on the Sermon on the Mount without questioning its authenticity. That liberal theologians under the Lutheran name are capable of leaping like *The Exp. Gr. Test.* and others does not surprise us. Whoever stands pat on the Scriptures does not leap. A. B. Bruce is still in mid-air. He admits this by the general statement: "While the experts in modern criticism have done much to provide a purer text, their judgments in many cases do not accord, and their results cannot be regarded as final" (*The Exp. Gr. Test.*, I, 52). Yet this expositor states definitely: "a liturgical ending, no part of the original prayer, and tending to turn a religious reality into a devotional form." But "every argument must be clear, satisfactory, convincing" (E. C. Griffith). With respect to the rejection of the Doxology, the arguments of the modern critics are not clear, satisfactory, convincing. Bruce's third canon, when applied by right to the entire *textus receptus*, speaks for, and not against, the retention of the Doxology. (1 Tim. 1:17; 2 Tim. 4:18; Rev. 7:10.) His fourth canon can also be used in favor of the Doxology. Doxologies are nothing exceptional, but in common use in the Old Testament and no less in the New Testament. They are a characteristic mark of the true religion, for they express confidence in God and love to Him, free of fear. They are an evidence of the perfect communion of the saints below and the saints above. Jesus does not omit doxologies. His omission of this doxology in Luke is no more an evidence against it than His omission in Luke of the ascription "Who art in heaven" argues against its authenticity in Matthew. But ℵ B D Z omit it. Yet Δ Σ, and many others have it. The trustworthy *Peshitto* records it. So we abide by the *textus receptus*. Modern criticism rejects this text until it is proved tenable; we accept the *textus receptus* until it is proved untenable. Doxologies recorded in Scripture need not be traced to liturgical orders. And ought not every religious reality be turned into practice and applied in our devotional forms? A liturgical form does not render a religious reality less real or the text which teaches the reality less authentic.*

There is no need of informing our congregations that modern criticism has relegated this doxology to the noteworthy rejected readings. Some members may question its inspiration. But if we

---

* On the question of the genuineness of the doxology opinions differ and probably will continue to differ. It is important for all of us to see that we are here dealing with a point of scholarship, and not with a test of loyalty to the Scriptures. — Ed. Note.

discuss with our members, as we sometimes do, the modern attacks on the text of Scripture or the various readings, we must also assure them that the doctrine of verbal inspiration and modern textual criticism are not the same thing. "Wenn wir von der Inspiration der Schrift handeln, so wirkt der Hinweis auf Abschreibefehler und andere Ursachen der 'verschiedenen Lesearten,' die sich in den Abschriften finden, verwirrend, wenn wir nicht zugleich genuegend darlegen, dass diese Dinge mit der Inspiration der Schrift nichts zu tun haben" (F. Pieper, *C. T. M.*, Vol. I, p. 469).

As the petitions of the Lord's Prayer are recorded in various forms also in the Old Testament, so we find the Conclusion in 1 Chron. 29:10-13, a solemn effusion of awe and wonder. The objection that the use of the Conclusion is a surrender to the Hebrew custom of beginning and closing a prayer must be met by 1 Tim. 1:17; Rom. 11:33-36. Is Hebrew custom carried into heaven? For we wait eagerly for the moment when we may join those who stand before the Lamb and with sinless tongue and pure lips praise the Lord: "Salvation to our God, which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb" (Rev. 7:10). The Book of Revelation is crowded with doxologies. The doxology therefore is not confined to Hebrew custom or mere liturgical practice: It is the expression of praise offered by the universal Church at all times on earth and in heaven.

But strictly speaking the Conclusion is not a doxology. It is an argumentation. I know of no inspired doxology which is introduced with ὅτι. The Conclusion refers to the petitions as a unit, and it is appended to the prayer to reinforce each petition. It is directed to the Father, yet not to the exclusion of Jesus, who taught us to pray with the help of the Holy Spirit.

The ὅτι — for, because — is argumentative. We are taught to advance arguments for praying, and for praying as we do. One such argument is God's command to pray and praise; another is His promise to hear and to answer. Jacob prays: "I will not let Thee go except Thou bless me." The Syrophoenician woman argued: "Truth, Lord! Yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their master's table." Jeremiah is quick with arguments in his lamentations and in his prayers. "Righteous art Thou, O Lord, when I plead with Thee. Yet let me reason the case with Thee" (Jer. 12:1). And v. 3: "But Thou, O Lord, knowest me: Thou hast seen me and tried my heart toward Thee." (See Jer. 15:15; 10:6; 14:9.) Moses pleaded argumentatively. Jesus adduces arguments in His Sacerdotal Prayer and in His first prayer on the Cross. The Psalms teach us how to reason with the Father. Jesus tenderly plants arguments into our hearts, where they should grow and become fruitful. In the verse preceding the Lord's

Prayer He says: "Your Father knoweth what things ye have need of before ye ask Him." Our own need, our neighbor's need, the past, the present, the future, the blood of Jesus offer many arguments which might be embodied in this conclusion. The conclusion of this prayer includes the reason why we call to the Father, our ground for believing that He will answer our prayer; the praise for His hearing and answering; our dependence on Him and our sincere promise to serve Him. And since we are not bound to the exact form of the Conclusion, we may extend and augment our argument by a reverent reference to the wisdom and knowledge of God, to His grace and mercy, to His omniscience and omnipresence, to His faithfulness. This we do not in the critical spirit of altering or improving the substance, but in the freedom of enriching the form. The Conclusion expresses our filial trust and confidence in the Father and His unfailing love.

The word *Amen* was used already by the children of Israel. (Deut. 27:15.) Jesus used it often. The Church repeats it here in time and there in eternity. No sooner have our petitions and arguments been uttered than we express our unwavering confidence of immediate and future experiences of the Father's providence and grace.

We may conclude the prayer with a double *Amen* as the expression of courage, submission, and confidence and as the name of our blessed Savior. Rev. 3:16: "These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true Witness, the Beginning of the creation of God." Hence we may indicate, in our thoughts at least, that we close our prayer with the very name of Jesus. Then we rest our case and cheerfully trust. If we must wait, we wait for His appointed hour. "He who blesses himself in the earth shall bless himself in the God of truth; and he that sweareth in the earth shall swear by the God of truth because the former troubles are forgotten and because they are hid from mine eyes" (Is. 65:16). Kings and queens, slaves and servants, have uttered this *Amen*. It marks the solemn moment of silence after the prayer in the sickroom, and it rests on the lips of the departing as the expiring breath. It seals holy wedlock, and it rises as on wings from the battlefield to God's throne. It is spoken by the strong with a resolute voice, and it is whispered by the suffering with a quivering sigh. It is heard by the Father and answered, for His is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever and ever.

We remarked before that all the tenses in the petitions are the aorist. In the Conclusion, however, we have the present, ἐστίν, which indicates that the Kingdom, the power, the glory have always been His and are His now. That these realms will be His in eternity is clearly stated in the text. This conclusion, used as

a doxology, reminds us of the doxology in Rev. 4:8: "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty, which was and is and is to come." None can wrest from Him His kingdom, power, and glory. These are secure in Him. Each realm bears the definite article. Every other kingdom, power, and glory fade into insignificance, into nothing.

The Lord's Prayer is designed for the pastor's personal and official use. As he closes the Prayer, he manifests the spirit of deepest humility: "Behold now, I have taken upon me to speak unto the Lord, which am but dust and ashes; . . . let not the Lord be angry, and I will speak." The beggar bows before the King; the impotent bends before the Omnipotent; the inglorious kneels in the presence of the glorious God, who lives in light which no man can approach. The begging pastor has filled his mouth with petitions to the King, reasons with the Almighty, and offers an argumentation to the wise, glorious God. The pastor speaks to God by invitation. He is a privileged person. He is a beggar made rich by the King, a weakling endowed with power and courage by the Strengthener, robed in the merit of the Savior, introduced, supported, and unfailingly represented by the Mediator, whose glory surrounds the throne. The pastor is the child of the Father. He has access to the Father's heart. He is the ambassador who has audience with the King.

How does the pastor reason with God? He assures the Father that he does not seek his own glory, but in all things for which he asks he desires to promote the reign, power, and glory of God, which will be manifested by the hearing and granting of these petitions. The pastor asserts that there is not a trace of selfish or worldly interest in the asking and that the benefits bestowed will redound to the glory of the Father. Furthermore he argues that the Father, having bound Himself by promise, can and will answer all petitions. The Father's glory is His faithfulness and truth. But the pastor's prayer is not a childish yammering; it is not a brazen demand: It is the child's, the ambassador's, the heir's reasonable request based on God's command and promise in the opening words and supported at the conclusion by argumentation first given to the pastor, then presented by him, then accepted again by the Father.

In Jesus, for Jesus, with Jesus we rest our prayer.

Los Angeles, Calif. G. H. SMUKAL