

THE SPRINGFIELDER is published quarterly by the faculty of Concordia Theological Seminary, Springfield, Illinois, of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

- ERICH H. HEINTZEN, *Editor*
 RAYMOND F. SURBURG, *Book Review Editor*
 DAVID P. SCAER, *Associate Editor*
 MARK J. STEEGE, *Associate Editor*
 PRESIDENT J. A. O. PREUS, *ex officio*

Contents

PAGE

EDITORIAL

Toward Denver

RESPONSES TO "WHAT COMMITMENT TO THE 'SOLA GRATIA' IN THE LUTHERAN CONFESSIONS INVOLVES"

- RICHARD J. SCHULTZ 3
 ERICH H. HEINTZEN 7

RESPONSES TO "THE LUTHERAN CONFESSIONS AND 'SOLA SCRIPTURA'"

- EUGENE F. KLUG 12
 FRED KRAMER 23

RESPONSES TO "THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH IN THE LUTHERAN CONFESSIONS"

- JOHN F. JOHNSON 28
 JAMES WEIS 34

BOOK REVIEWS 42

BOOKS RECEIVED 68

INDEX TO VOLUME 32 (1968-69) 70

Indexed in INDEX TO RELIGIOUS PERIODICAL LITERATURE, *published by the American Theological Library Association, McCormick Seminary Library, Chicago, Illinois.*

Clergy changes of address reported to Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri, will also cover mailing change of *The Springfielder*. Other changes of address should be sent to the Business Manager of *The Springfielder*, Concordia Theological Seminary, Springfield, Illinois 62702.

Address communications to the Editor, Erich H. Heintzen, Concordia Theological Seminary, Springfield, Illinois 62702.

Comment on "The Lutheran Confessions and 'Sola Scriptura' "

EUGENE F. KLUG

ON SCRIPTURE there is no choice in the fellowship quest. If we, the members of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, are at all what we claim to be, then the fellowship we seek with other Lutheran bodies is certainly one that includes unanimity on the article of Scripture. Purity and consistency in the body of Christian teaching depend on it. A "consensus" without unanimity on the article of Scripture would militate against our Confessional stand. For "*Sola Scriptura* is written on every page of the Confessions of the Lutheran Church."¹

The *Sola Scriptura* principle is not only defended by our Confessions; it is primarily and first of all taught by the Scriptures themselves. While it is true that the Confessions devote no special article to the subject, they demonstrate it from beginning to end. They weave a tapestry on which the Gospel is central but the threads are all *sola Scriptura*. For them it is the God-given and only legitimate way of operating in theology.

Fellowship discussions with the American Lutheran Church, or with any other must be based on this principle. More than that, they dare not skirt the crucial fact that today more than ever Scripture is under fire, even from its erstwhile friends.

The joint commissioners' essay on "The Lutheran Confessions and *Sola Scriptura*" chose a narrow focus. It managed to avoid present day controversial issues by restricting itself in such a way that the incisive elements dividing Lutheran churches today could be—and were!—avoided. "It did not address the *real* twentieth century problem which disturbs the whole Christian world," charges a recent book, *The Maturing of American Lutheranism*, and the same source goes on to say: "Rather, it played it safe by confining itself to the sixteenth century!"²

But the essay is no mere museum piece. Some things it accomplishes excellently well. The all-too-easy asseveration that the Confessions have no article on Scripture and say nothing about Scripture or the *sola Scriptura* principle and its proper application is adequately demolished. What the document fails to do is to confront squarely, with clear-cut answers, the modern aberrations on Scripture, particularly those introduced by the neo-orthodox school. Nor does it deal with the present reality, that much of ALC teaching, writing, and publishing is committed to this stance. We shall trace these concerns, showing where the document should have spoken more pointedly, showing too where the ALC parts company with the *sola Scriptura* principle, particularly as it espouses neo-orthodox thinking on Scripture.

I. The Word of God

In the first place, Lutherans need to restate for our times that the Holy Scriptures *are* the Word of God, not merely in a manner of speaking, but in fact. We are well aware that their chief content is the *WORD*, namely, Christ. In this divinely given circle there is no conflict. He who is the Word, also constituted and designated Scriptures to *be* His Word. With Luther, therefore, we have respect for the divinely chosen instruments, “coverings” or “masks” (*larva Dei*), by which He comes to men. This is His gracious way of revealing Himself to man, for in His naked majesty God is unapproachable and unknowable for man. So, with Luther, we are prepared to say unequivocally:

The Holy Scripture is the Word of God, written and (as I might say) lettered and formed in letters, just as Christ is the eternal Word of God cloaked in human flesh. And just as Christ was thought of and dealt with by the world (in *der Welt gehalten und gehandelt*) so is the written Word of God, too.³

In Holy Scripture there is a unique confluence of the divine and human, resulting in an objectively inspired text. It is not an easy thing for human reason to accept, yet Holy Scripture is *God's Word* in fact. This does not rule out other revelations of God. Luther, the Confessors of 1580, the orthodox seventeenth century dogmaticians, were all perfectly aware of the fact that God's revelation in times past was not limited to this text alone, that there were different modes of revelation; but they were all convinced, as Lutheran theologians, that “Christian Theology is derived from an infallible source of knowledge, viz., divine revelation, which, *for the present state of the Church*, is *mediate*, i.e., comprehended in the writings of the prophets and apostles.”¹

The commissioners' essay skates around this question, affirming only that “the Scriptures are God's address to man.” It does not make plain that the Scriptures are the Word of God *ontologically*, that is, in their very being, in their very form as God-given text, and also *functionally* or *dynamically*, because they bring God's Word to the hearts and minds of sinners to work faith. By stressing only the latter point, the essay, wittingly or unwittingly, plays into the hands of neo-orthodox thinking.⁵ Almost all recently published ALC literature, periodical or book form, is committed to the neo-orthodox line of thinking which allows one to call the Bible the “Word of God” and yet not actually mean it in so many words. This is true of the by-now-well-known *The Bible: Book of Faith*, a resource book in the ALC's Leadership Education Series; also, *Theological Perspectives; When God Speaks; A Reexamination of Lutheran and Reformed Traditions* etc. Unfortunately, it is also true of articles that appear under “Missouri's” aegis. With editorial approval the *Concordia Theological Monthly*, March, 1969, offers an article by Dr. Kent S. Knutson, newly appointed president of Wartburg Seminary, on “The

Authority of Scripture," who, in the final analysis, argues against *sola Scriptura* as the formal principle in Christian theology, stating:

The authority is in its material principle, in its substance, not in the character of its form. In the Scriptures God speaks to us His judgmental and His redemptive word, and we hear Him speak. That is its power. That is its authority.⁶

It is a sad day for Lutheran theology when under guise of safeguarding the "redemptive word" a sophisticated argument is framed to repudiate the formal principle, *sola Scriptura!* However eloquent the testimony to Christ as the true and only core in theology, there is no guarantee that this will endure, if the formal principle, Scripture, as the inspired, authoritative Word of God, is denied, as is done in Knutson's article by telescoping it into an ambiguous "redemptive word." Fuzzy theology is already evident in ALC publications on the Gospel itself. For example, instead of clear testimony to the central article of the Reformation, the sinner's justification before God by faith through Christ's vicarious atonement, it is stated that the *substance* of Christ's teaching is "bringing the rule of God into the world in a dynamic and new way,"⁷ and that the "key to understanding what the Bible offers us is a new self-understanding, an authentic existence."⁸

For this reason it is not proper for Lutherans to agree that "Barth introduces a useful distinction between objective and subjective revelation,"⁹ when he limits objective revelation to the mighty acts of God, and subjective revelation to the conversion experience of the believer who comes to confront God through the proclamation of these revelatory acts. What Barth is saying is that revelation occurred then and there, when God spoke to Moses, when Christ came, taught, died and rose, and it occurs now in the believer's illumination in faith, but that the Scriptures, which are in between, are *not* God's revelation, but merely a record, witness, or medium through which revelation may come when and where it pleases God, the Holy Spirit.

Lutherans, from Luther's day on, have for good reasons insisted on the objectivity of the Scriptures as the revelation of God, since they are God's inspired instrument. This they are ontologically in their very being, by their very origin. They do also have a functional purpose by God's own ordaining, and that is to turn hearts to faith through the Gospel which they proclaim as the Holy Spirit's chosen medium or vehicle. Since God has chosen to make them what they are, we dare as little despise their exalted nature and position—on the grounds that they were written through human "witnesses"—as we dare despise or make excuses for the flesh in which Christ was incarnate. Both are veils of God (*larva Dei*), with emphasis on *God!*

II. Inspiration

Lutherans need, secondly, to reiterate that inspiration is Scripture's own way of accounting for the fact that it is the Word of God.

To the Confessors of 1580 this meant plenary, verbal inspiration, as it did to Luther, and it was the very ground on which *sola Scriptura* rested. Even Althaus, in his recent book on Luther's theology, has to admit, though he does so regretfully, that Luther was bound to the literal and plenary inspiration of Holy Writ, the objective fact of its being "inspired in its entire content by the Holy Spirit," even to its very words.¹⁰ Of course this is exactly what Luther had said: "Every word of Scripture comes from the revealed God."¹¹ This was the unassailable testimony of God in His Word. There is tacit support for the doctrine of inspiration in the commissioners' essay but it could, and should, have been much more explicit.

Plenary inspiration is a term of embarrassment to many Lutheran theologians today because of their commitment to the historical-critical method. It does not fit with their relativized view of Scripture's authority and inspiration. "Lutherans have fallen into the snare of absolutizing the relative," charges Professor Warren Quanbeck of Luther Seminary, St. Paul, "by a theory of inspiration which removed them (Scriptures) from the realm of the historical and contingent."¹² Quanbeck's is not an isolated opinion. *The Maturing of American Lutheranism* documents how the ALC has gradually and officially adopted the same position. This, more than anything else, removed the last roadblock for fellowship between the LCA and the ALC.

III. Authority

This leads to a third observation. Lutherans today, especially in view of what was shown above in connection with Barth's influence, must give wholehearted support to Scripture's *normative* authority. As our Confessions correctly put it, Scripture is "the only rule and norm according to which all doctrines and teachers alike must be appraised and judged . . . the only judge, rule, and norm according to which as the only touchstone all doctrines should and must be understood and judged as good or evil, right or wrong."¹³ The Confessions also properly speak of what is known as Scripture's *causative* authority, that is, the power under the Holy Ghost to turn men to repentance and faith through the preaching of the Gospel which is their chief content or doctrine.

The commissioners' essay is quite right when it states, in reference to the Confessions, "there is a truly massive emphasis on the work of the Holy Spirit in and through the Scriptures." But it errs, or at least is very naive, when it stresses this dynamic ("God speaking," *Deus loquens*) side of Scripture over the objective ("God has spoken", *Deus locutus*) givenness of the Scripture as the Word of God. Both truths must stand, like two sides of the same coin. This is all the more imperative because modern theology is unwilling to view the Scriptures as the objective result of God's *having spoken*, or *having inspired* His Word in written form. By and large, they stress *only* the dynamic side of Scripture, as the vehicle through which God prompts the proclamation of the Word, which is Christ.

So, with Luther we have to state clearly, as he does in the *Smalcald Articles*, that no man receives the grace of God "except through or with the external Word which comes before."¹⁴

A curious comparison, not to say un-Lutheran and un-Scriptural, is likewise set up in the commissioners' essay with the proposition: "Only from the perspective of *sola Gratia* can one properly speak of *sola Scriptura* in the sense of the Lutheran Symbols." Let it be said here that, as far as the Lutheran Confessions are concerned, this theological truism could just as well be reversed: Only from the perspective of *sola Scriptura* can one properly speak of *sola Gratia* in the sense of the Lutheran Symbols! An unwarranted grading of the "solas" is made implicit here by the cast of the sentence.

Closely connected with Scripture's authority is its inherent perspicuity and clarity, so basic to its proper interpretation and articulation of doctrine. Instead of this, the commissioners' essay presses only the Law/Gospel principle in exegetical enterprise. This is a proper emphasis. But it may also be misunderstood. In fact it may be, and often is, misused. For example, it has led to the unwarranted denial, or at least shelving, of certain parts of Scripture's content on the grounds that some things, viz., geographical, historical, poetical, etc., are not involved in the Law/Gospel syndrome, and therefore not finally and ultimately important in theological discussion, nor even divisive of church fellowship.

The principle of the careful distinction and relation between Law and Gospel which Scripture introduces and makes basic to all interpretation is its own. It dare never be used *against* Scripture itself, as a kind of "superior analogy of faith," or as a mechanism for subtracting from or delimiting what Scripture says, even things which do not directly relate to its central teaching of God's grace in Christ. Luther, for example, would be the very first to pounce on anyone who had the temerity to use his little formula, "what preaches or presses, Christ" (*was Christum treibet*) in a wrongful way, that is, as a selective tool on Scripture's corpus rather than as an interpretive key for Scripture's meaning! It is true he once said, "If the adversaries press the Scriptures against Christ, we urge Christ against the Scriptures."¹⁵ On the other hand, Luther counters: "Stick to the Word" (Scriptures)! "Ignore every other—whether it is devoid of Christ, in the name of Christ, or against Christ, or whether it is issued in any other way."¹⁶ Can you miss his point? There is a lot of pious "Jesus talk" and "Jesus religion" that passes for Christianity these days; but it is worth nothing unless it stands *under* Scripture, the "touchstone" for all teachers and all teachings, as he *and the Confessions* made so eloquently clear.

IV. INERRANCY

With the debate on Scripture's inerrancy we come to the crux of the matter as far as inspiration and authority are concerned. If it is granted that the human factor in Scripture's unique origin

inevitably precludes an infallible text, then obviously many of the things claimed for Scripture must be yielded. Not least of these would be inerrancy itself. It is a truism almost too simple to state, that if the Scriptures do not assert inerrancy for themselves then obviously we have no right to do so either. By the same token, if such assertion is made, then the church would be sorely remiss and derelict in its duty if it failed to assert this article without equivocation, apology, or embarrassment. Here it is not a matter of academic nicety or propriety, but of Christ's own witness to Scripture. Since inerrancy of Holy Writ is the platform on which Christ, our Lord, stands, the church had best look to its own stance!

Inerrancy of Scripture may still be a treasured truth among many ALC pastors and people, but among its leaders and in its theological schools it is, as Barth puts it, "a battle that once had its time but has now had it."¹⁷ The position of the ALC president, Dr. Fred A. Schioltz, is no secret by this time. He frankly disavows that "a commitment to textual inerrancy" is required by the doctrine of Scripture's inspiration and then tries to throw people off guard by warning that the support of inerrancy is a virtual denial of theology of the cross (*theologia crucis*).¹⁸ Professor Harris Kaasa of Luther College asks: "What is added to its authority (the Bible's) by insisting on inerrancy? Why does it need this man-made prop? Why can it not stand on its own authority?" The fact is, of course, if he were to face these questions on Scripture's terms, he would have his answers, and he would have been kept from the insupportable charge that from Biblical inerrancy "all other doctrines were deduced."¹⁹ It is not the term "inerrancy" for which we contend. But the *thing termed*, the fact that Scripture teaches inerrancy side by side with its authority, this is the issue!

In the opinion of Professor Gerhard Forde, also of Luther College, verbal inspiration by its very use leaves the impression "that faith is a matter of believing a number of doctrines,"²⁰ that "Lutheran theology does not need the verbal inspiration method," and that in its place we ought to keep "the law-gospel method" because it "is better and more in accord with Scripture."²¹ One need only ask, where in Lutheran theology did Forde ever learn that "these two methods are quite different," as he says?

The claimed insights of scholarly erudition and linguistic science have taken a heavy toll. Professor Ronald Hals of Capitol Lutheran Seminary frankly states his full acceptance of the literary and form critical methods, with open rejection of inspiration for large parts of the Old Testament, and repudiation of the objective, normative authority of Scripture. For him the raising of Lazarus story is, for example, not "authoritatively reliable" because, alongside the synoptics, we must "regard the Johannine account as not historical."²² Professor Wilfred Bunge hits hard at the New Testament's historical accuracy and inerrancy, stating: "On the face of things the gospels appear to be straightforward records of the life and teachings of Jesus. This they are not . . . They are filled with

theological claims and confessions or interpretations which go far beyond the objective events of the history of Jesus."²³

This means that students of theology in the ALC get their schooling under teachers who find it difficult, indeed impossible, to think any longer of the Bible as a corpus of divine truth, inherently, objectively, and qualitatively, the Word of God, binding and inerrant. With definite bias towards historical and form critical methods of judging Scripture's content and meaning, these teachers commit themselves to the so-called scientific approach to Biblical studies. Condescendingly, chidingly, Professor Warren Quanbeck prods:

For those nurtured in absolutizing ways of reading the Bible or the confessions, the initial encounter with historical scholarship may indeed be a kind of shock, but those who stay with it can testify that it is one of God's gifts to our times, to enable us to hear His Word with clarity and power.²⁴

The issue ultimately is not scholarly erudition, but biblical commitment. Luther faced the challenge with child-like and dutiful candor, and we should face it in the same way. On whether we can believe the *Genesis* account of woman's creation from the rib of Adam, Luther, who was perfectly aware of the sport made of the manner of Eve's creation, asserted: "We dare not give preference to the authority of men over that of Scripture! Human beings can err, but the Word of God is the very wisdom of God and absolutely infallible truth."²⁵

For Luther, as I think it must be for us, to imply that Scripture contained error was not only contrary to what the Scripture itself testified concerning its inerrancy in passages like 2 Timothy 3, 16; John 10, 35, and others, but, above all, an insolent affront to God who first gave it. Luther was aware of many of Scripture's so-called "errors," which Professor Philip Quanbeck argues are natural and perfectly obvious in a book of human origin. Quanbeck devotes his entire book to trying to prove the Bible's fallibility.²⁶ But Luther, unlike Quanbeck, was unwilling to be budged one inch from what Scripture witnessed of its infallibility.

Moreover, Luther even anticipated by centuries the maneuver which casts the reliability of Scripture in relative terms. This is the stance of the ALC's teachers of theology, that the Bible is absolutely and infallibly right in all matters pertaining to its *saving* proclamation, that is, as regards the "redemptive word,"²⁷ but fallible and subject to the usual human foibles and failings on other matters not central to salvation. Luther insisted, on Scripture's own evidence, that it must be an absolute inerrancy, no matter with what difficult problems our human reason might be left. Dare we do less?

Dr. C. F. W. Walther caught Luther's thinking exactly, when years later he warned:

Beware, beware, I say of this "divine-human Scripture." It is the devil's mask. For eventually it constructs such a Bible

after which I would not wish to call myself a Bible Christian . . . For if I believe that the Bible contains errors, then it is no longer a touchstone for me, but needs a touchstone itself. In short, it is unspeakable what the devil tries with the "divine-human Scripture."²⁸

Walther apparently had the prefatory words of the Formula of Concord in mind. He knew, too, how the Confessions reprove people who accept what "agrees with reason and treat the rest as mythology," or expendable.²⁹ The fact simply stood, as Luther put it so well in referring to the evident human side of the Scriptures: "Although they were also written by men, they are not of men nor from men, but from God."³⁰ To assume that they were also faulty and subject to error because they had a true human side was as wrong, as far as Luther and Walther were concerned, as to teach that there was sin in Jesus because He had a human mother and a true human nature.

Some of these emphases the commissioners' essay should have included, in order that the full dimension of what the Confessions mean when they speak of Scripture's reliability, that "they will not lie to you," might have been stated for our day. Obviously, in the thinking of the Lutheran Confessors, the inspired, divine character and authority of Scripture included also the absolute infallibility of the Holy Scriptures as God's Word. The question is pertinent: Do the ALC-LCMS commissioners really feel that they reflect the Confessions fairly and fully by merely saying that "the Scriptures as the Word of God provide the church with the adequate, reliable, and efficacious means for her work"? Or by allowing that "they make explicit reference to this attribute in contexts that are associated specifically with the Gospel" only? This language would hardly cause a ripple among liberals.

Hands of holy horror have time and again been piously raised by the new (actually it is as old as the proverbial hills) school of thinking on Scripture's nature. Solemnly and with theological sophistication they charge those who support the teaching that Scripture is inspired in plenary, verbal, inerrant way with Docetic-Monophysite heresy. The fact that this heresy (heresies) had nothing directly to do with Scripture's inspired, inerrant nature does not deter them from using what appears to be a formidable barb. The Docetic heresy involved the denial of the true humanity of Christ, as our readers will recall, with Christ merely "appearing" to have a human form. The supposition is that all who support the divine side of Scripture's character and origin must somehow deny Scripture's human side and teach that God dropped it into the lap of His church by a kind of divine hocus-pocus. Professor Warren Quanbeck of Luther Seminary, St. Paul, is one of the chief prompters of this unfortunate and unfounded charge of Docetic heresy. He reasons:

Any doctrine of Scripture which denies or abridges the fully human character of the Bible is a danger to the Gospel of the church . . . For just as the revelation of God is given in the human being Jesus of Nazareth so also the Word of God is given through the historical witness of men in the Bible.³¹

No Lutheran knowingly denies or abridges the truly human side of Scripture, as little as he denies or abridges the true humanity of the Lord Jesus. But no Lutheran, worth the name, draws the conclusion from this, that Jesus according to His human nature was anything but perfect! Nor will any Lutheran worth the name, say less of Holy Scripture, in view of its divine inspiration! Quanbeck's point is all too clear: human authorship is historically conditioned by human frailty and that means the possibility of human error. Does he wish to teach the same lesson about Christ according to the human nature, too? The Confessions speak with absolute confidence about Scripture as "the sole rule and norm of all doctrine," because of its divine origin and nature, even adding that "no human being's writings dare be put on a par with it."³² What profound respect the Confessors had for its divine character! Were they guilty of Docetism? Almost sounds like it. If this is Docetism, then let's have more of it!

Is not the question which those are asking who doubt the divinely-given, verbal, plenary inspiration of Scripture through human hands really this: Are these Scriptures really and throughout the very Word of God? Once they refuse Scripture's own avouchment here concerning itself, is not the next threat for them that they won't be able any longer to answer the question, "What think ye of Christ, whose Son is He?" correctly either? The tract, "Who Can This Be?" is vivid, tangible proof and a case in point, as is also a text like *When God Speaks* in its sections on the meaning of Christ for our day.

Inerrancy used to be a perfectly respectable, as well as correct, term among Lutherans in describing Scripture's infallible nature. Today, however, by virtue of the wholesale adoption of the judgments of higher criticism, the term has virtually become one of embarrassment to Lutherans. So much so, that now not those who deny it are made to feel uncomfortable, but those who support it. A strange turn of events for those committed to the Lutheran Confessions!

What has happened to bring biblical theology within the Lutheran church to this pass in our day? Our Savior gave the answer, and it is always the same in every day, the human predilection, ever since the Fall, of "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Luther's chief criticism of Erasmus was not first of all his theology but his insolent and superior attitude over against God's Word, Holy Scriptures, and he fired point blank at this sore spot with the question: Would not everyone prefer to be a skeptic over against the Holy Scriptures? Put in equivalent terms today Luther's argument would be this: If the first premise is granted that the Bible is merely a

human, fallible record of God's saving acts in history, and not His inspired Word which never errs, then there is nothing to tie down the flighty spirit of man as he lords it over the Word with his "superior" insights and the "assured" results of scientific research and investigation. In this position Walther was no different from Luther and the Confessors, when he said:

It is absolutely necessary that we maintain the doctrine of inspiration as taught by our orthodox dogmaticians. If the possibility that Scripture contained the least error were admitted, it would become the business of *man* to sift the truth from error. That places man *over* Scripture and Scripture is *no longer* the source and norm of doctrine . . . (and) introduces a rationalistic germ into theology and infects the whole body of doctrine.³³

Once man no longer stands with holy fear and awe before the "it is writtens" of Holy Scripture, then the state of the church will be worse than that of Israel in the days when "there was no king in Israel" and "every man did that which was right in his own eyes." (Judges 21, 25). It is then when "every heretic finds his own explanation convenient,"³⁴ when Scripture's authority lies rejected.

Without question Scripture is key to the present consensus debate within Missouri. With what glasses a man looks at Scripture will pretty well determine where he stands on fellowship with the ALC.

FOOTNOTES

1. Theo. Engelder, et al., *Popular Symbolics*. Concordia, St. Louis, 1934, p. 2.
2. Herbert T. Neve & Benjamin A. Johnson, ed., Augsburg, Minneapolis, 1968, p. 223.
3. WA 48, 31, 4; *St. L.*, IX, 1770.
4. David Hollaz, *Examen Theologicum Acroamaticum*, 61 (Quoted in H. Schmid, *Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, p. 26.) Emphasis added.
5. Barth, for instance, emphasized the centrality of Christ as the epitome of the revelatory acts of God in history, but denied that Holy Scripture was ever to be identified with revelation itself. Thus, by leaving Scripture in the category of other human literary products, subject to the same kind of critical, historical, cultural, scientific judgments, a human product of great value, but fallible nonetheless like its authors, he achieved what many thought was the acme of theological triumph in being able to bow politely in two directions, both to liberal theology and also to evolutionary science. He was ready to receive the results of discovery from either one of these camps, or both.
6. *Op. cit.*, p. 164.
7. Philip A. Quanbeck, *When God Speaks*. Augsburg, Minneapolis, 1968, p. 121.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 101.
9. Fred Kramer, "The Christian Faith and Revelation," *Concordia Theological Monthly*, April 1969, p. 169.
10. Paul Althaus, *Theology of Luther*. Fortress, Philadelphia, 1966, p. 50.

11. LW 12, 352. It is worth noting that Luther, whose views on *James* are well known, will nonetheless quote that epistle with due reverence as the Word of God, as in the *Bondage of the Will*, for example.
12. "A Dialogue on Authority and Inquiry—The Lutheran Understanding of Authority," National Lutheran Education Conference Proceedings, Jan. 15-16, 1967, p. 50f.
13. *Formula of Concord* (Epit.), Preface, Tappert, p. 464f.
14. *Smalcald Articles* III, VIII, 3-4. Tappert, p. 312.
15. LW 34, 122.
16. LW 22, 451.
17. Karl Barth, *The Word of God and the Word of Man*. Harper, New York, 1957, p. 61.
18. From Dr. Schiotz's essay on "The Church's Confessional Stand Relative to the Scriptures."
19. *Theological Perspectives*, published by Luther College, p. 18.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 67.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 52.
22. cf. Ronald M. Hals' essay, "The Authority of the Text Today," presented at a state-wide, pan-Lutheran pastoral conference in Texas recently.
23. *Theological Perspectives*, p. 42.
24. Quanbeck, "A Dialogue . . ." p. 50f.
25. LW 1, 22.
26. cf. *op. cit.*
27. cf. Knutson's essay, CTM March 1969.
28. *Concordia Theological Monthly*, Nov. 1961, p. 674.
29. *Apology* VII & VIII, 27.
30. *Works of Martin Luther* (Phil. Ed.), II, p. 454.
31. Warren Quanbeck, *A Reexamination of Lutheran and Reformed Traditions*, 1964, p. 24.
32. FC (SD) Introduction, concerning Scripture as Rule and Norm, Tappert, p. 505.
33. Quoted in *Lutheran Loyalty*, July 1951, p. 14.
34. Luther, *Bondage of the Will* (Packer-Johnston), p. 261.