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NOTES ON THE HEBREW VERB

Our studies last time took us into the work of J. Wash Watts. We learned that while his staunch advocacy of the aspect theory is really nothing new, but another presentation similar to that of S.R. Driver and others, he does offer us something quite novel and revolutionary to consider when he postulates a distinct function for the weak form of waw with sheva, the function of always indicating a parallel, and a corresponding distinct function for the strong form of waw with pathah, the function of always indicating a sequence. The strong form of waw, when linked with the imperfect in the waw consecutive construction, expresses temporal or logical sequence: usually in the form of coordination, occasionally also, however, in the form of subordination. Elements are added to one another as links in a chain. By contrast, however, the "waw conjunctive" (Watts' name for the weak waw), never in any of its uses indicates a sequence, but always indicates a parallel: elements are stacked upon one another (if such a rough picture may be used) in a pile, rather than attached end to end. There is not an advancing from one thing to another, but a filling in of details in an overall picture, a grouping of facts next to one another so as to produce one larger whole. This is sometimes done by coordinating, sometimes by correlating, and sometimes by subordinating. Correlation is the descriptive term employed by Watts whenever a perfect is linked to the waw conjunctive, and it is described by him as being heightened or intensified coordination. As "father" and "son" are correlative ideas and imply each other, so a perfect linked to waw conjunctive and the preceding verb imply each other; they are correlative. Watts insists that all perfects thus linked with the waw conjunctive are correlated to the preceding verb; they are being used to fill in the subordinate parts of an overall picture. Watts therefore rejects the commonly held view that there is a waw consecutive construction with the perfect, just as there is such a construction with the imperfect. That is, he rejects the view that there is a perfect linked to waw which is the consequence, whether temporal or logical, of the preceding verb.
This is certainly a novel and challenging presentation. Are there any objections that might come to mind?

One senses that a careful examination of terminology is in order. Let's begin with the term "conjunctive." A central part of Watts' theory is the distinction between the respective functions of the two forms of waw. A glance into the dictionary, however, confirms our suspicions that waw "conjunctive" can be a misleading term for what he has in mind. The dictionary definitions of the terms involved do not suggest the drawing of a parallel, but simply the more general idea of joining things together, something which it seems could be applied with equal propriety to the waw consecutive constructions with the imperfect. Here, for example, is how the American Heritage Dictionary defines "conjoin": "To join together; connect; unite." Its definition of "conjunctive" is this: "Joining; associative; connective;" "Serving to connect elements of meaning and construction in a sentence, as and and moreover." (our underlining) While this criticism, if justified, does not deal with the substance of Watts' presentation, but only with his use of terminology, it is perhaps well for us to take note of this point, lest we be misled by a less-than-appropriate term into an incorrect understanding of what Watts is saying.

If we try to come to grips with the actual substance of Watts' distinction between sequences and parallels and their application to the use of the Hebrew verb, we may still have our questions. Though we may be taken by surprise at first, a little thought will show that coordinate clauses may readily fit under both categories. Making up our own examples is the most helpful exercise in this. "He will go to town and buy some groceries." "He often went outside and shovelled snow." (Better yet: "Go and shovel snow." ) In each case, two verbs are coordinated. But the thrust of the sentences is not to indicate sequence. Really, only one thing was accomplished, although more than one action comes into the picture. Such sentences would remind us of the perfect with waw conjunctive in Hebrew. On the other hand, we might have a couple of sentences like these: "Joe ate breakfast, then shovelled off the sidewalk, then did some business in town. After that he read a book, then played
basketball, and finally came home and rested." The sequence is apparent. Such sentences in Hebrew would employ the waw consecutive with the imperfect. Thus we may grant such different kinds of coordination. And we may grant that a language other than English could lay greater stress upon the distinction between such kinds of coordination than we are accustomed to, differentiating between the two by means of formal features.

Our suspicions may linger longer and be less easily laid to rest, however, when we consider that, according to Watts' theory, subordinate clauses also fit in both categories. One of the four categories into which Watts divides the waw consecutive clauses with imperfect is that of logical cause (Cf. p. 7 of the December, 1976 Journal). This category (and possibly also the category of logical contrast) might appear to stretch its limits and burst its boundaries. Can logical cause properly be viewed as indicating a sequence? If it can be so viewed, it is a sequence in reverse, thus the very opposite of the other three categories of waw consecutive with imperfect. Can it not also be viewed as having more in common with the clauses which indicate a parallel? On the other hand, we have a large class of subordinate clauses used with the parallel-indicating waw conjunctive. It is very common for the weak waw to be linked with an imperfect in a purpose clause. This too might appear to stretch things; could not such clauses easily be conceived as fitting rather with those clauses or sentences which are linked together to indicate a sequence?

This writer, for one, is left gasping for air on such heights of abstraction. We wonder if we have really grasped the broad categories, in view of what is included under them. Are Watts' categories being stretched so far and so freely, that they are finally bereft of real meaning, usefulness, and applicability? Are his ideas so broad that they cannot be falsified, hence shown to be devoid of significance? Is Watts, for the sake of logical neatness, elaborating a framework which is not able to hold all the material for which it is designed? These are questions which at least pass through one's mind.

The other key point which demands our scrutiny is
the "correlative perfect" of Watts. Is he right in re-
jecting the "consecutive" perfect with waw and in making 
all perfects linked with waw "correlative" perfects? 
That, too, is a large question, and some consideration of 
it will be made in connection with our summary of the 
book review of Watts' grammar by A.R. Crabtree, a gram-
marian who takes issue with Watts on this point and be-
lieves that there are both correlative and consecutive 
perfects with waw.

Perhaps it is that peculiar looseness of Hebrew 
which is such a formidable barrier to overcome in one's 
efforts to classify constructions neatly and accurately, 
and which has such a way of defying even the best of ef-
forts to elaborate a conceptual framework which adequately 
accounts for all the material.

Yet, though we may have our doubts, even serious 
doubts, about these points, it must be conceded that much 
of Watts' analysis commends itself as being accurate to a 
high degree and very helpful. To a large extent, the 
distinction between the two kinds of waw seems to fit, 
even if we feel uneasy about going to the extent of 
translating the imperfects with waw consecutive with the 
somewhat cumbersome, "And he proceeded to ...." Likewise, 
Watts' exposition of the concept "correlative" in appli-
cation to the perfect with weak waw must be conceded to be 
an eminently helpful descriptive device. We can well 
understand it when Watts explains that he was led to this 
from observation of the use of the perfect in future time 
after an imperative.4

But we will now want to examine what others have to 
say about Watts' book.

R.E. Wehrwein

FOOTNOTES

1. The aspect theory has long since had legitimate 
claim to being called the "traditional" theory, for until 
challenged earlier in this century, it had been generally 
accepted as having replaced the older "traditional"
theory of tense which held the day before Ewald, Driver, et al.

2. We do not here enter into the question of the use of waw apart from verbs in the linking of clauses. There is one sentence in which Watts applies the term "waw conjunctive" to a waw not linked to a verb: "Comparison may be observed in clauses linked by waw conjunctive, as in Job 5:7." (p. 101) But it seems that Watts intends the parallel-indicating function to be restricted to the waw linked to verbs. "There are two forms of waw as a conjunction with verbs. The simple form, usually written with shewa, is called waw conjunctive. The special form, usually written with pathah and followed by daghesh forte, is called waw consecutive. ... Waw conjunctive appears always to indicate a parallel." (p. 103) Under the heading, "Use of Waw Conjunctive in Co-ordination," Watts writes (p. 111): "The coordination of clauses wherein verbs are separate from waw and assume wide dissimilarity, as in Isa. 46:4, is not in question here."

3. Thanks to Pastor Norman Greve, who was kind enough to send me his copy, I have now been able to examine also the first edition (1951) of Watts' book. (Unless otherwise noted, however, all quotations in this article are still taken from the 1964 edition.) While the differences between the two editions are not that great, a quick comparison turned up a few paragraphs worth quoting from the first edition. A couple of brief and helpful explanatory paragraphs are grouped together on pp. 90-91. Watts is explaining the relationship between verbs linked by waw conjunctives:

"At times the relation is merely temporal, indicating simultaneous existence; at times it is also logical, indicating synonymous meaning; and in both cases there is a co-ordinate parallel, the two verbal states being made for the time being to enjoy equal rank and order.

"At times the two verbs are counterparts of each other. Not merely do they exist simultaneously but they are logically identified. Not merely are they given equal rank and order for the time being but
they enjoy it inherently and permanently. This is a correlative parallel.

"At times the second verb is subordinate to the first, making its clause dependent. The two verbal states exist simultaneously, but the second is contingent upon the first. This is a collateral parallel.

"In all three cases there is a parallel by reason of simultaneous existence of the verbal states, and the parallel is indicated by waw. In each case, however, a distinctive meaning is indicated by the logical relation of the forms linked by waw."

On p. 97 we are given the "Summary Conclusions Concerning Waw Conjunctive":

"When a perfect is linked by waw conjunctive to any other verb, the relation is correlative. When an imperfect is linked to any other verb not synonymous with it, the relation is subordinate. In all other cases the relation is co-ordinate.

"Onlyperfects can be correlated by waw conjunctive. Only imperfects can be subordinated by it. All verbs except perfects can be co-ordinated by it."

On p. 100 we are given the "Conclusions Concerning Waw Consecutive":

"When waw consecutive signifies temporal sequence, logical result, or logical contrast, it serves as a co-ordinating conjunction. It serves as a subordinating conjunction only when signifying logical cause."

The first edition also has Appendix A, "A Distinctive Translation of Selected Passages From I Kings, Chapters 2-8." It is very helpful, for a total of 56 constructions, mostly the various types of verbs but also various types of clauses, are carefully listed and numbered. In the sections quoted from I Kings 2-8 in Watts' own distinctive rendering, each construction is labelled with the appropriate number, so that the reader can identify it by comparison with the list.

We scanned the entire reading quickly, intending to
find all the prophetic perfects and all consecutive imperfects used to indicate logical cause or logical contrast. This hasty and perhaps not entirely accurate search turned up logical contrast with the consecutive imperfect in 2:15 ("is turned about," - KJV; "is become," - KJV, and thus all quotations), 2:29 ("sent"), 2:30 ("And he said, Nay"), 3:21 ("But when I had considered it"), 8:16 ("But I chose"), and 8:18 ("And the Lord said"); logical cause in 2:5 ("whom he slew," "and shed," "and put"), 5:11 ("For he was wiser," - the KJV reference here is not 5:11, as in the Hebrew, but 4:31), and 8:24 ("Thou spakest also"); and prophetic perfects no place.

The number of correlative perfects is very considerable. Watts himself calls our attention to certain sets of them: 2:2 (3), 6, 7, 9 (2); 2:31 (2), 32, 33; 3:9; 8:28-50. Perusal of these verses will give the reader the flavor of these constructions.

4. The pertinent paragraph is found on pp. vii-viii of the preface to the 1951 edition of Watts' grammar:

"The starting point of this study was, first of all, a state of rebellion against the confusion into which previous treatments lead the student of Hebrew. The next was observation of uses of the perfect in future time, especially after an imperative. It is usual for an imperative to be followed by a string of perfects with waw rather than other imperatives, such as we would use, and such as the Hebrew author could use if he so desired. Further observation revealed that such a string of perfects with waw is always so closely related to the initial imperative as to break down its commission into details. When an author desires to turn to an unrelated commission he uses another imperative. He, of course, could use another imperative at any time, according to his pleasure. These observations led to the hypothesis that a perfect with waw expressed a correlative idea. Extensive observation of the behavior of these perfects with waw in all sorts of cases led to the fixed conclusion that this is the way they are always used in the Old Testament."
The word which designates the Lord's Supper, as it is understood and practised in the Roman Catholic Church, is the Mass. It is included as one of the seven Sacraments of the Roman Church, and at the same time it is commonly referred to as the Sacrifice of the Mass. We generally think of a Sacrament as something which God gives to us, whereas a Sacrifice is something which we direct to God. In the case of the Lord's Supper, the Roman Church regards it as being both Sacrament and Sacrifice. They believe that the priest offers it as a sacrifice, both for the living and for the dead, and that in it the atoning sacrifice of Christ on Calvary is daily repeated.

HISTORY Nowhere are we specifically told that Jesus released the Israelites who believed on Him from the sacrificial ritual of Moses. In His early ministry, His words in the Sermon on the Mount would tend to presuppose their participation therein, when He says: "If thou bring thy gift to the altar ...," Matt. 5:23. On the other hand, He proclaimed a worship of God in spirit and in truth, not limited to Jerusalem or any other geographical location, John 4:21-24. Later on, the apostles testified that Christ Himself was the true Sacrifice given for the sins of the world. "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us," 1 Cor. 5:7. "Christ also hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweetsmelling savour," Eph. 5:2. "Ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot," 1 Pet. 1:18-19. "Lo, in the midst of the throne ... stood a Lamb as it had been slain," Rev. 5:6. The Epistle to the Hebrews carries out this argument in detail, and shows that the offering of Christ as the eternal High Priest was made once for all, Heb. 7:27;
9:12 and 28; 10:10. This being the case, it does not need to be repeated. To repeat it is to suggest that Christ's sacrifice of Himself on the cross was not enough to atone for all the sins of all people, and must therefore be continually repeated by men.

On the other hand, the apostles were far from discarding the idea of spiritual sacrifice from religion. This idea was included in the teaching of the spiritual priesthood of all believers. "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ ... But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people ...", 1 Pet. 2:5 and 9. In this sense, the writer to the Hebrews speaks of praising the Lord and doing good as being sacrifices. "By Him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to His name. But to do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased," Heb. 13:15-16. So also Paul writes: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice ...," Rom. 12:1. He speaks of the gift he had received from the Philippians as "a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God," Phil. 4:18. He compares the faith of the Philippians to a sacrifice, Phil. 2:17.

The Mosaic sacrificial ordinances were therefore only a temporary system. They were a picture of the one great sacrifice which Christ would offer up. Since no additional sacrifices for sin are needed, the New Testament now regards as true sacrifices: a heart consecrated to God, faith, obedience, righteousness, and prayer. These sacrifices can be offered up acceptably to God only by those who are members of the spiritual priesthood -- the believers in Jesus Christ.

It was in this sense that the idea of sacrifice was at first associated with the Lord's Supper. In the apostolic age, the agape, or love-feasts, were connected with the Communion service. Even after these were separated, the members of the congregation brought offerings of bread and wine which were used, not only at the Com-
union, but also in the support of the clergy and for the relief of the poor. These gifts were called "oblations" and "sacrifices." The bread and wine as such were offered, not the body and blood of Christ. The offering was not an atoning sacrifice, but a sacrifice of thanksgiving. It was made by the congregation, not by the clergyman alone. It was called a "bloodless sacrifice," not in distinction to the sacrifice on Calvary, but to the bloody sacrifices of the ancient world.

A new meaning was given to these offerings when the bishops and presbyters came to be clothed with the functions of a clerical priesthood. Cyprian first advocated the priestly idea, regarding priesthood and sacrifice as correlates. He treated the whole Communion service as an offering wherein not only sacrifices of bread and wine were made, but of Christ's body and blood. Cyril of Jerusalem spoke of the atoning sacrifice in the Lord's Supper. More and more, the Lord's Supper came to be regarded as a true sacrifice. The Eastern Church continued to hold to the spiritual nature of Christian sacrifice, while the Latin Church laid an increasing emphasis on the sacrificial notion. Gregory the Great saw a victim on the altar, through which the sufferings and death of Christ are repeated.

The effects of the Communion were regarded as expiatory, but at first only for so-called "venial" sins. "Mortal" sins were to be paid for by penance. But it conferred blessings in every relation of life. There are masses against drought and too much rain, storms, sickness, etc. Many magical effects were reported. Masses were even offered for the dead. Augustine hoped that God would deal with the dead less severely than their sins merited. Gregory, by his doctrine of purgatory, established a final warrant for this custom. He taught that the dead were helped out of purgatory by the prayers, and especially the masses, of the living.

In the early church, the celebration of the Lord's Supper was confined, for the most part, to the Lord's Day and to the anniversaries of the martyrs. Later it was repeated every day. After the time of Leo the Great, it was repeated several times each day. In the 8th and 9th
centuries, when the number of chapels greatly increased, the priest often found himself without a congregation at the time of the celebration. Thus arose the controversial private masses, in which the Lord's Supper was separated from the Communion of the congregation.

The 13th century marked the beginning of a new epoch in the history of the Lord's Supper. The Roman Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation was fixed in the year 1215. In proportion as the sermon was neglected, the sacrificial functions of the priesthood were emphasized. Thomas Aquinas said that the priest, like Christ, was the mediator between God and the congregation, and that the consummation of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper did not lie in the participation of believers, but in the consecration of the elements. Thomas Aquinas was the real founder of the Mass. He drew a sharp distinction between Sacrament and Sacrifice. The Mass came to be regarded as propitiatory, removing even "mortal" sins. The benefits of the Mass were not confined to those who were present to participate in it, but extended ex opere operato to the absent, among whom the dead were included. The Mass came to be regarded as a true immolation upon the altar by the hands of the priest.

THE COUNCIL The Council of Trent gave the doctrine of the Mass its final form on Sept. 17, 1562, at its twenty-second session. It defines it both as a Sacrament which is received and a sacrifice which is offered. Over the centuries this definition has been interpreted as being a confirmation of Christ's eternal priesthood, spoken of in the Epistle to the Hebrews, thus suggesting that His sacrifice was to continue to all times. It is held that when Jesus said: "This do in remembrance of Me," that this had reference to offering a sacrifice.

The doctrine of Transubstantiation leads naturally to the doctrine of the Mass. If the body of Christ is truly offered up in the Eucharist, then it follows that it is the same body offered on the cross, except that in the one case it is bloodless. Then the Mass does have a propitiatory power in effecting the forgiveness of sins, as well as preserving from the commission of mortal sins.
And then it is also useful for all the perplexities and difficulties in life.

The canons and decrees of the Council of Trent brought out the idea of sacrifice in all its baldness. The participation of communicants was not regarded as being indispensable to its efficacy. What was regarded as indispensable was the act of consecration by the priest, interceding for the living and the dead. We might mention also the practice which the Council confirmed, that of mixing water with the wine before its consecration, to represent the union of the church with its head. The words of consecration are spoken in an undertone, for they are spoken only to the elements, to change them into Christ's body and blood. It is in the Mass, therefore, that the central idea of Catholicism is involved, namely, the mediating and propitiatory functions of the church, which believes that the incarnation and sacrifice of Christ are repeated every day.

THE CELEBRATION In the apostolic age, the celebration of the Lord's Supper consisted in the Christians' continuing steadfastly "in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers," Acts 2:42. During the following years a simple service developed, by which the didactic and the sacramental portions of the service were distinguished.

The Mass falls into two main parts, the first being a preparatory celebration; the second, the sacramental, followed by the post-communion. Each part of the service was introduced by the words of the priest: "The Lord be with you," and the response of the congregation: "And with thy spirit." This would indicate that the early idea included the presence of a congregation. The second part of the service included five priestly prayers. The first of these five prayers implores the Father to receive the immaculate host which "I offer to thee for my innumerable sins, and for all circumstances, and also for all faithful Christians, both the living and the dead," etc. The second prayer is then offered at the mixing of the water and wine. The third asks that the sacrifice being consummated may be well pleasing in God's sight. In the fourth and fifth the priest asks the Sanctifier to
bless the sacrifice and to accept it. Thereupon the service includes the words "This is my body." After uttering these words the priest bows his knees and prays to the Christ who is present in the host, and then shows it to the congregation, that it may do the same. He then places it on the "corporale" and again kneels before it. He does the same with the cup. The whole process is called the "elevation and adoration of the host." At this point the Catholic Burial service book contains this explanation: "After the Consecration, Christ is upon the altar in a sacrificial state; recall to mind that each Mass is offered to honor, glorify, thank almighty God; to make reparation to Him for the sins of man; to obtain for us all graces and blessings."

In the year 1203, Cardinal Guido, papal legate in Cologne, ordained that when the host was elevated, the congregation should fall on its knees at the ringing of a bell, and remain kneeling until the consecration of the cup. Pope Honorius III, in 1217, raised this enactment to the dignity of a permanent and universal obligation. This portion of the service is concluded by the celebrant's breaking the host over the mouth of the cup, and allowing a piece to fall into the cup, thus signifying both Christ's suffering and the reunion of His soul and body. The bread is then dispensed to the communicants, if any are present.

The Mass in the Roman Catholic Church takes the place of meditation upon the Word of God, as is the custom in our churches. Thus the people are indissolubly bound to the priest, without whom the principal part of her worship cannot be performed. A mysterious and pompous ritual is connected with the celebration of the Mass. Roman Catholic theologians refer to the contrast which the beauty of this worship presents as compared to the plainness of our service, with hymns, a brief liturgy, and a sermon. The Council of Trent decreed that this service was to be in Latin. Only recently has this decree been lifted, causing mixed emotions among Roman Catholics.

VATICAN COUNCIL II

What changes, if any, have been made in the doctrine of the Mass by Vatican Council II? In its Decree on the Sacred
Liturgically, Vatican Council II declared: "It is through the liturgy, especially the divine Eucharistic Sacrifice, that the work of our redemption is exercised ... To outsiders the liturgy thereby reveals the Church as a sign raised above the nations. Under this sign the scattered sons of God are being gathered into one Body, until there is one fold and one shepherd."

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, in its "Instructions on Eucharistic Worship," quoting from the Decrees on the Liturgy issued by Vatican Council II, explained:

Hence the Mass, the Lord's Supper, is at the same time and inseparably:
* A sacrifice in which the Sacrifice of the Cross is perpetuated.
* A memorial of the death and resurrection of the Lord, who said "Do this in memory of me."
* A sacred banquet in which ... the People of God share the benefits of the Paschal Sacrifice, renew the New Covenant ... and in faith and hope foreshadow and anticipate the banquet in the kingdom of the Father, and proclaim the Lord's death "till His coming."

The Bishops' Instructions furthermore declare: "There should be no doubt in anyone's mind that all the faithful ought to show this most holy sacrament the worship which is due to the true God, as has always been the custom of the Catholic Church. Nor is it to be adored any less because it was instituted by Christ to be eaten. For even in the reserved sacrament He is adored because He is substantially present there through the conversion of bread and wine which, as the Council of Trent tells us, is most aptly named transubstantiation ... These are the principles from which practical roles are to be drawn to govern devotion due to the sacrament...."

It is apparent, then, that no essential changes in the doctrine of the Mass were brought about by Vatican Council II. In recent years it has been spoken in the vernacular, and certain other external changes are permitted. But the doctrine remains the same. Here
Rome has not changed.

LUTHER Luther, of course, had much to say concerning the Mass. When he was at the Wartburg, he admonished the papists for giving a different character to the Lord's Supper. He said:

Note then, the fraud of the priests, who have turned the testament into a sacrifice. God bestows it upon us and gives it to us, but they offer it as a sacrifice. This is nothing but charging God with a lie and considering Him foolish for calling it a testament, because it is impossible for a sacrifice to be a testament. The former we offer, the latter we receive; the former comes from us to God, the latter comes from God to us; the latter is performed for us.\(^6\)

Again Luther says:
That the Mass is neither a sacrifice nor a work, the words of Christ's institution prove; then also the example of the apostles themselves and of the whole primitive church. Furthermore, let those who celebrate Mass be asked what the use and benefit of their Masses are. If they say they are celebrated to abolish sins or to serve God, their godlessness is clear, since there is only one sacrifice for the abolishing of sins, namely, Christ, once sacrificed. Of Him all are made partakers, not by doing or by sacrificing but by believing, through the Word alone. Blasphemous it is to add something to this sacrifice, as if it had not entirely removed the sins of all men. This, then, must be the choice: either all sins, past, present, and future, have not been canceled by Christ's death, or the Mass cannot be a sacrifice or work for sins.\(^7\)

In this connection, our readers will do well to read again Luther's Smalcald Articles, especially Article II on the Mass. There, among other things, he says:

"When the Mass falls, the Papacy lies in ruins."\(^8\)
"The Word of God shall establish articles of faith, and no one else, not even an angel."\(^9\)
"In short, the Mass itself and anything that proceeds from it, and anything that is attached to it, we cannot tolerate, but must condemn, in order that we may retain the holy Sacrament pure and certain, according to the institution of Christ, employed and received through faith."\(^{10}\)

Our conclusion is inescapable. Nothing has changed, essentially, in the doctrine of the Mass since the time of Luther. It is still offered up as a sacrifice for the living and the dead. It is still looked upon as a work which people can perform (a sacrifice they offer to God), in order to obtain forgiveness of their sins. Therefore it still says that Christ's sacrifice of Himself upon the cross was not really sufficient to atone for all the sins of all people. So it is that the Smalcald Articles are still up-to-date and are most helpful to us in understanding what the Mass is all about. May God graciously preserve us in the true faith and confession all of our days!

A. Schulz

FOOTNOTES

3. *Decree on the Liturgy*, Par. 2.
7. St. L. Ed. XIX: 1187.
In recent years Bethany Lutheran Junior College and Seminary (ELS), Mankato, Minnesota, has been hosting a series of "Reformation Lectures." The latest in the series were held on October 28 and 29, 1976, and were presented by Professor E. C. Fredrich, Chairman of the Department of Historical Theology, Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary, Mequon, Wisconsin. In three lectures, Professor Fredrich discussed "The Quest for True Lutheran Identity in America." These lectures were published in the Fall, 1976, edition of The Lutheran Synod Quarterly, the theological journal of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod (ELS), edited by the theological faculty of Bethany Lutheran Seminary.

Prof. Fredrich titled his three lectures: I. Trailblazers and Trains (from the beginning of Lutheranism in America to the formation of the Synodical Conference in 1872); II. Shake-Down and Shape-Up (from 1872 through the 1930's); and III. Losers and Finders (from 1938 to the present). As can be noted from these titles, the author chose to treat his topic historically, tracing the story of the growth and development of the Lutheran church in the United States, as a quest for Lutheran identity. Early on, however, he defines "True Lutheran Identity" in the following way:

"The quest being described in these lectures is to be thought of as attainable. True Lutheran identity is no elusive will-o'-the-wisp, no El Dorado beyond the horizon. It is real, as real as anything taught in Scripture. It can be found, it must be found, by following the Bible's own directions."

After indicating that he does not intend to say that true Lutheran identity can be attained through some He-
gelian evolutionary process or some historical development, the author states that "there has been some true Lutheranism in the Old World and there has been some in the New." As far as this reviewer is able to ascertain, the lectures do not in any place make an effort to isolate or describe the true Lutheranism in the Old World mentioned by the author. Was it in Germany? Sweden? Norway? When? 16th, 17th, or 18th century? Of course, the general topic is limited to the quest for Lutheran identity in America, but when the ideal sought and found in the New World is described as being the same (evidently) as in the Old, the reader would find it helpful to know precisely what the point of comparison is.

Near the end of his introduction, the author presents his first statement to define the objective of the quest he is discussing:

"These lectures proceed from the conviction that true Lutheran identity is achieved by a firm commitment in confession and practice to the full inspiration, inerrancy, and authority of Scripture and to the Lutheran Confessions as a faithful norma normata."

This is an excellent statement, and one could have no quarrel with it, even standing alone, if it had been made in Synodical Conference circles in the 1920's or 1930's, perhaps. Today, however, in the light of what has been said and done by Lutherans (chiefly their leaders) in America since then, each key term in that definition (inspiration, inerrancy, authority, Scripture, etc.) needs to be set forth in a more extended manner. Too many Lutherans, as indicated by the sordid developments at the Missouri Synod's Concordia Seminary at St. Louis, culminating in the formation of the Seminary in Exile, have been able to promulgate too much theological rubbish and downright heresy while at the same time hiding behind the same theological terms. Prof. Fredrich seems to feel, in his introduction, that he will be open to criticism from the more liberal side for limiting true Lutheranism by his definition. I, on the other hand, feel that he should have already in this introductory portion identified what he means by true Lutheranism in
the Old World and should have demonstrated that with more extended definitions of his terms. It is true that he brings, in a historical or chronological manner, a fuller description of the conflict over inerrancy, Scripture, unionism, etc., in the third lecture.

Immediately following his definition of true Lutheran identity, as quoted above, Prof. Fredrich declares: "The corollary conviction holds that in history this kind of commitment was achieved in the Synodical Conference that organized in 1872 and ceased to function in the 1960's. Its precious heritage has found haven in remnants clustered around this city and mine."

We would not want, nor do we find it necessary, to infer from these words that the author intends to include the entire period of Synodical Conference history from 1872 to the 1960's as being the height of true Lutheranism. After all, as he also relates, much of that period, especially from 1938 on, was tainted by doctrinal statements emanating from within the Synodical Conference that were not soundly Lutheran. Perhaps, however, we observe a logical pattern of thought, proceeding something like this: "When a church body loses its true Lutheran identity it must be described as such, and connections with it must be severed. In 1961 the WELS suspended its fellowship relations with the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, and in 1963 with the Synodical Conference. Therefore, it was at that point that the Synodical Conference lost its true Lutheran identity." We have, after all, seen that type of logic presented by WELS spokesmen before, notably in the explanations presented later on as to why WELS did not obey God's directive to suspend fellowship relations upon identifying the LCMS as a church body that was causing divisions and offenses. It went something like this: "If the WELS judged the LCMS in that way, then it would have been wrong not to break off fellowship relations. Therefore it is evident that WELS did not yet find the LCMS guilty." Circularity, however, is unconvincing.

We find it rather strange for Prof. Fredrich to speak of the "precious heritage" of the Synodical Conference as having found haven in "remnants clustered
around this city and mine." One has to travel through some 44 pages before the metaphor of small groups in the vicinity of Mankato and Mequon is interpreted for us. On page 46 we read: "Whether we like it or not [!], the heritage of the Synodical Conference has been bequeathed to two small synods that virtually had to destroy the Conference by their withdrawals in order to keep that heritage alive. The Synodical Conference's definition and realization of true Lutheran identity is ours."

So, in answer to one's query as to the nature of true Lutheran identity, the quest for which is discussed in these lectures, Prof. Fredrich responds by declaring that it is that Lutheranism which was to be found at some unspecified time and place in Europe, in the Synodical Conference from 1872 to the 1960's, and at present within the ELS and the WELS, and only there! The absolute limiting of true Lutheran identity in America to these two synods is expressed in the following:

"The matter could be summed up by quoting what the old Quaker said to his wife as an expression of his dissatisfaction with the prevailing state of affairs. The Quaker said, 'Everybody in the world is queer but thee and me and sometimes I have my doubts about thee.' Summing up what is wrong on the quest for true Lutheran identity in our land at this time, your guest lecturer turns to his hosts and says, 'Everybody in the land is wrong but thee and me.' The rest of the quotation is not applicable." (p.46)

The Saxon founders of the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod had been in this country since 1839. Although their first years were fraught with difficulties in ridding themselves of the confusion and distrust engendered by the defection of Stephan, yet, under the leadership of C. F. W. Walther, their course was soon held in the way of true Lutheranism. This is shown with great care by J. P. Koehler in his *The History of the Wisconsin Synod*, for example on page 81, where he speaks of Missouri's doctrine: "A study of the early volumes of Lutheraner and Lehre und Wehre will reveal that their simple, instructive, all-embracing and extensive setting
forth of what a Lutheran Christian should know and treasure is unrivalled by any printed word of that day. Those writers were delving into the great Gospel treasure of the past and like unsophisticated children marveling at their finds. Thus they had really something to tell their readers whose minds had been bored and whose hearts had been starved by the inanities of declining Rationalism. They were restoring the old wells and a fresh flow of the water of life." Thus Koehler describes the Missouri Synod in the 1850's and 1860's, during which period of time the Missourians, by and large, regarded the Wisconsin Synod as unionistic and un-Lutheran. In relating Missouri's handling of certain well-known cases of intersynodical conflict on the local congregational level, Koehler faulted Missouri only for its manner of dealing, but granted that "they were right about their protest against unionism." (Koehler, p. 86)

Truly, historians have clearly recognized that God worked through the testimony of the Missouri Synod to bring about true, Lutheran confessionalism in the Wisconsin Synod. From before 1849 (the year of the organization of the Wisconsin Synod) until 1868 the Missouri Synod dealt with the Wisconsin Synod from outside the framework of recognition and fellowship. It was on October 22, 1868, that Wisconsin was recognized by Missouri as an orthodox Lutheran church body.

In this connection, it is easy to understand why Professor Eugene F. Klug, of Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne, Indiana, one of the official reactors to the lectures, criticizes the author for failing to give "more than passing notice" to Walther and his influential writings. The criticism appears to this present reviewer to be eminently valid. In lectures comprising nearly 58 pages of print, some scant twenty lines are devoted to the positive influence of Walther and the Missourians in the quest for true Lutheran identity in America. For some reason, Prof. Fredrich evidently does not wish to include the early Missouri Synod period from its organization in 1847, at least, until the formation of the Synodical Conference in 1872 as being truly Lutheran. One notes, on the other hand, that Dr. Klug presents about seven pages of material in his critique to
testify to the true Lutheranism of the early Missouri Synod — yes, before it was able to recognize the Wisconsin Synod as being an orthodox Lutheran church body.

One is grateful to Dr. Klug for including in his reaction a more exhaustive statement on principles and practices, espoused and fostered by Walther and others, that set forth what true Lutheranism is. He (Klug) refers, for example, to the four free conferences held between 1856 and 1859 which were of such great influence: "In the aftermath of and through the free conferences Walther expressed a principle, which became a working rule for conservative Lutherans thereafter, namely, that organization, fellowship, union, merger, etc., ought in every case follow, not precede, the quest and discovery of genuine doctrinal unity and consistent churchly practice." (p. 61) The Wisconsin Synod, on the other hand, was following a somewhat different practice when, in 1866, it associated itself with the short-lived General Council before it became evident that that association's doctrinal stand was correct on paper only, and Wisconsin felt constrained to leave the organization in 1869.

In a masterly way, Klug also sets forth a description of the resources which our Lutheran forefathers in America had in their quest for true Lutheran identity, chief among which were the writings of Martin Luther. "... like the confessors at the time of the Formula of Concord, a document which brought the quest for true Lutheran identity to a successful conclusion in 1577, they plowed deeply and thoroughly through all of Luther's writings. If it is impossible to explain the Formula of Concord without men like Chemnitz and Adreae [sic], great students of the Scriptures and of Luther, it is equally impossible for you and me to understand today the nature of true Lutheran identity without reference to our founding fathers and their deliberate 'driven-ness' into the writings of Luther. Need it be stated, then, that if we truly intend to be Lutheran in this day, a day which has witnessed the disclosure and the deception of liberalism among us, particularly higher critical methodology in Biblical theology, then our refrain must necessarily sound like this: 'We were driven into the writings of Luther.' When we have exhausted that field, then these
lectures may well have reached their terminus!" (p. 64)

As a final comment on this matter of omission, on the part of Prof. Fredrich, of an adequate discussion of true Lutheranism as found in the Missouri Synod before the organization of the Synodical Conference, this reviewer appreciates also the inclusion by Prof. Klug of some of the theses presented by Walther in his essay, "The Evangelical Lutheran Church and True Visible Church of God on Earth." We note that this work was published in 1866, the same year in which the Wisconsin Synod helped to form the General Council, which Missouri did not join.

It does, therefore, seem to this reviewer that the lecturer's limiting true Lutheranism to the Synodical Conference from 1872 to the 1961's narrows the field too much when it so unfortunately excludes the contribution of the Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod and its founding fathers in the two and a half decades preceding 1872.

The third and only (in Prof. Fredrich's view) area in which true Lutheran identity is to be found, at the present time, is the Evangelical Lutheran Synod (ELS) and the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod (WELS). This, presumably, has been the case ever since these two church bodies suspended fellowship with the LCMS and the Synodical Conference.

Had a reactor from the CLC been invited to the 1976 Reformation Lectures, his criticism would have been similar to that of Prof. Klug, but in connection with a different historical period. For when, in his third lecture, Prof. Fredrich traces the demise of the LCMS as a true, Lutheran confessional church body, it is interesting to note that he omits any mention of the historical fact that not only did those two church bodies (WELS and ELS) separate themselves — at different times and in different ways — from the LCMS, but that also within WELS and ELS separations took place, resulting in large part in the formation of the CLC. The omission is consistent. (In his conclusion, in which Prof. Fredrich wonders whether, in addition to WELS and ELS, there may be more finders of a true Lutheran identity in the future, he thinks
that "a most likely place to look for them is the Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod." Even in speculation he makes no comment regarding the existence of the CLC!)
We note also, in passing, that the same author, whose five lectures on the general subject of "Wisconsin's Interchurch Relations" at the Fall, 1975, Mequon Seminary Pastors' Institute are being published in the WELS' theological journal, has a similar omission in the lecture dealing with "The Great Debate with Missouri" (Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly, April, 1977, pp. 157-173). The sole comment referring there to a separation within the WELS is: "A break [between WELS and LCMS] in 1955 or 1956 or 1957 might have prevented withdrawals, but the break in 1961 could be declared on a clear and demonstrated doctrinal difference." (Ibid., p. 173)

While we of the CLC do not expect that members of the WELS or ELS might share our feelings and doctrinal concerns, yet it does seem that an objective observer of history might make some comment concerning our existence. It is a historical fact, after all, that those individuals who withdrew from the WELS and ELS (also, of course, from the LCMS and the Synodical Conference) did have roles that they played in the years prior to their withdrawal. Because of his silence regarding them, we must assume that Prof. Fredrich regards them as not involved in the quest for a true Lutheran identity. Yet some of them were individuals of some influence in their former church bodies; most of them were probably quite vocal in certain areas. Perhaps we are somewhat of an embarrassment for someone seeking to describe the quest for true Lutheranism. Rather than to discuss us in a true historical perspective, it is perhaps easier to make no mention at all. Easier, but not truthful! But, then, we have seen WELS' attempts at revisionism at work before. (Cf. "On Rewriting History," Journal of Theology, June, 1975, pp. 26-38.)

Speaking of that, Prof. Fredrich has a fascinating way of attempting to describe two actions that were actually different as though they were practically alike, in his relating of events taking place in 1955: "In 1955 the Evangelical Lutheran Synod suspended fellowship with Missouri but continued to participate in Synodical
Conference affairs. In the same year Wisconsin all but did the same. It 'held in abeyance' for a year a final vote on a break resolution. In 1956 Wisconsin continued this policy." (p. 38) On the one hand, the ELS voted to suspend fellowship with the LCMS; on the other hand, the WELS did not vote to suspend fellowship but, rather, postponed voting on the matter. These two actions are not the same; that is, they are not the same on paper.

Perhaps unconsciously and without intending to do so, the lecturer spoke more truly than he thought. The ELS, although purportedly breaking off fellowship with Missouri in 1955, justified continued forms of selective fellowship with Missouri by pleading that it did so "within the framework of the Synodical Conference." (Certainly this is a far cry from what the WELS later termed the "unit concept" of fellowship practice. It also is not in accord with Walther's statement on fellowship quoted earlier.) The WELS, on the other hand, also continued to practice fellowship with Missouri, albeit a so-called "vigorously protesting" fellowship, even after having stated with unanimous voice in its 1955 convention: "The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod has by its official resolutions, policies, and practices created divisions and offenses both in her own body and in the entire Synodical Conference. Such divisions and offenses are of long standing." (1955 WELS Proceedings) So, in the actions following their 1955 conventions, the ELS and the WELS actually were doing the same thing — both in disobedience to God's clear directive in Romans 16:17-18.

As far as this reviewer is aware, Prof. Fredrich, in his statement that Wisconsin "all but" suspended fellowship relations with Missouri, comes nearer to a true account of what took place in the WELS' 1955 convention than any recent statement coming from that synod. Back in 1955 through 1957, of course, current official interpretations were factual, in the main. It was after the re-interpretation of events proposed by Prof. Lawrenz and then espoused by the Protest Committee of the WELS, published in 1958, that Wisconsin's revisionism gained credence in that church body. It was, after all, a way out of the dilemma that disobedience to Romans 16:17-18 brought about. Wisconsin's latest official attempt to
revise its own 1955-1956 history by *fiant* can be seen in its Resolution No. 11 (1973 WELS Proceedings), where it is simply stated that the term "state of confession" used before 1961 to describe the fellowship relation of WELS over against the LCMS is shown by "the synodical resolutions in effect during that period" not to have meant to express a "judgment tantamount to that of Romans 16:17." One needs only to read the 1955 WELS Proceedings, as quoted above, to realize that Prof. Fredrich is somewhat closer to the truth.

When it comes to a description of the errors on the part of Missouri up to 1961, when WELS suspended fellowship relations, and of the subsequent, rapid spread of current doctrinal errors both in Missouri and among American Lutherans in general, the lectures are extremely well done. We quote a brief section as demonstration:

"True Lutheran identity will only be kept in America's third century if the deviant variety is recognized and resisted. The brand of Lutheranism that features laxity in doctrine and practice has become dominant among two of every three Lutherans in this land. Future events may force the ratio higher. Much ground has been lost in the present century. No more can be surrendered without ultimate risk.

"Refuge and strength will be found in the saving Word. Reductionism, historical-critical interpretation, and all other faulty approaches to the Scriptures need to be summarily rejected. The authoritative, inspired, inerrant Bible is the prized possession of the true Lutheran. By it he keeps his identity."

We can certainly agree with that statement, and also with one that follows, in which the author resists the suggestion "that the outnumbered conservative Lutherans in the various church bodies should realign themselves, pool their efforts and forget their doctrinal differences. [a la Otten in his Christian News? - J.L.] That is a Fundamentalist approach but not one that is Lutheran. It points to a pathway that leads directly
and immediately away from true Lutheran identity. It cannot lead to more finders on the quest."

We did not, of course, expect or hope that the lectures would include a discussion of the year 1959, a year which members of the CLC recognize as a "watershed year" (a favorite expression of the lecturer) for them. It was a "year of decision" because of a particular statement that was made and officially approved by the Wisconsin Synod that year. To illustrate by comparison, one such earlier "watershed" statement was that issued by the ALC in 1938 in which that church body declared that it was "firmly convinced that it is neither necessary nor possible to agree in all non-fundamental doctrines." When we knew what the ALC meant by "non-fundamental doctrines" (in strong contrast to what Walther understood by the term!), we recognized that as a historic statement, having much effect on subsequent developments. Similarly, Wisconsin took a firm position, which we recognize as Scripturally and confessionally untruthful and, therefore, as false doctrine, when in 1959 it accepted the statement as correct: "Termination of church fellowship is called for when you have reached the conviction that admonition is of no further avail and that the erring brother or church body demands recognition for their error." This statement truly sets forth a "clear and demonstrated doctrinal difference" between the WELS and those who withdrew from it and later formed the CLC. Coming to a conviction that admonition is of no further avail demands an omniscience that is possessed by God alone. Basing termination of fellowship on the expected course of future admonition is a clear violation of God's Word in Romans 16:17-18, where we are instructed that termination of fellowship ("avoid them") is called for when the individual or church body involved causes divisions and offenses by teaching contrary to the true doctrine. God has given the ability to "mark" (take careful note of) such "causers"; further prescience He has not given.

The logical extension of Wisconsin's false doctrine is the 1973 WELS statement in which continuation of fellowship with a heterodox church body is condoned under the plea that thereby the orthodox may bring Scriptural
testimony to "those brethren who are not themselves advocating and propagandizing the errors." (1973 WELS Proceedings, pp. 95-96) Although this is now *doctrina publica* in the WELS and, I suppose, in the ELS also, Prof. Fredrich claims that true Lutheran identity is today limited to those two church bodies. Yet the lecturer says: "A good position on Scripture and a good fellowship position go together. You can't have the one without the other. You need them both for true Lutheran identity." (p. 49) It seems to this reviewer that in that statement Prof. Fredrich has, without intending to, judged his two church bodies — and found them wanting.

*John Lau*

---

**BOOK REVIEWS**

*Is the Bible Inerrant,* by John D. Frey, 1976.*

The question that Pastor Frey proposes to answer in his 43-page pamphlet is, as he says in his brief introduction, an important and even a crucial one. IS THE BIBLE INERRANT? Or, to rephrase the question, can the term "inerrant" rightly be applied to the Bible? This question is currently in controversy not only in the LC-MS and in the ALC, but also in many so-called evangelical and fundamentalist churches. Cf. the current book by Harold Lindsell called *The Battle for the Bible* that has been reviewed in various nation-wide publications.

Pastor Frey's conclusion is that the Bible is inerrant. However, his understanding is that the term "inerrant" allows the possibility of inaccuracies and discrepancies in the details of history and in the con-

* *Presented to the Minnesota Pastoral Conference of the CLC, Oct. 24-25, 1976, by David Lau, pastor of Our Redeemer's Lutheran Church, Red Wing, Minn.*
cepts of science taught by the Bible (p. 43). He concedes that others use the term "inerrant" to mean "that there are no discrepancies of any kind, not even in quotations or at points of historical detail" (p. 43). Therefore he prefers to call the Bible "reliable, dependable, trustworthy, truthful" rather than inerrant, "words that point more to content than to incidental matters." (p. 43)

Pastor Frey's dictionary's definition of inerrant is the same as my dictionary's definition. Inerrant means "exempt from error; truthful." How can something that is supposedly exempt from error contain faulty science or historical inaccuracies? It should be clear that our usage of the word "inerrant" is not in agreement with Pastor Frey's understanding. We subscribe to the Brief Statement of 1932, which declares that the Scriptures "contain no errors or contradictions, but that they are in all their parts and words the infallible truth, also in those parts which treat of historical, geographical, and other secular matters." This is quoted also in Concerning Church Fellowship. Who are we to divide the Scriptures into "incidental matters" subject to error and matters of "content" which are inerrant? Jesus said: "The Scriptures cannot be broken" (Jn. 10:35). Appeals are made by the New Testament writers to individual words and individual letters and even parts of letters in the Scriptures. Jn. 10:34-36; Gal. 3:16; Mt. 5:18. (Cf. CLC Journal of Theology, Vol. 12, No. 4, Vol. 13, Nos. 1-2 for C. Kuehne's article, "Thy Word Is Truth.")

To be sure, it must be pointed out that the term "inerrant" does not apply in every respect to Bible translations or to copies of the original manuscripts but only to those documents written by holy men of God as they were moved by the Holy Spirit (2 Pet. 1:21). "We regard this Book of Books as the Word of God, verbally inspired and wholly without error as written by holy men of God." (Statement of Faith and Purpose of the Church of the Lutheran Confession) It may not be ungodly unbelief at all but conservative Christian caution to have doubts concerning the inerrancy and inspiration of those portions of the King James Version not found in all the oldest manuscripts (e.g. 1 Jn. 5:7; Jn. 5:4), or of those
books of Scripture not accepted as Scripture by the early Christian Church. (Cf. Luther's and Chemnitz's hesitation in accepting the antilegomena - F. Pieper's Christian Dogmatics, Vol. I, pp. 291-292; also Luther's statement about errors of copyists - op. cit., Vol. I, p. 295.)

Dr. F. Pieper taught: "We have never held that the copyists of the holy writings were inspired. Spelling mistakes or slips or attempted corrections in the copies have absolutely nothing to do with the inspiration of the originals." (op. cit., Vol. I, p. 237) "As we have a firm and fixed Word of God in the original despite the variae lectiones, so the current versions of the Bible present a firm and fixed Word of God, and this despite the fact that every existing translation contains occasional mistakes and is subject to continuous correction in the light of the original." (op. cit., Vol. I, p. 349)

Pastor Frey claims that the term "inerrant" is of recent origin. The term itself may be relatively recent, but certainly not the idea conveyed by the term. Cf. Robert Preus, The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism, footnote 241, pp. 394-395. Abraham Calov, for example, taught: "Not only must we hold to be true what is set forth in Scripture concerning faith and morals, but we must hold to everything that happens to be included therein. ... No untruth or error or lapse can be ascribed to the God-breathed Scripture." (quoted in R. Preus, op. cit., p. 341) Likewise, John Quenstedt taught: "Each and everything presented to us in Scripture is absolutely true, whether it pertains to doctrine, ethics, history, chronology, topography, or onomastics." (quoted in R. Preus, op. cit., p. 346)

Pastor Frey's views concerning the possibility of errancy in so-called minor matters was precisely the view taken by the Socinians, against whom our Lutheran fathers contended in the seventeenth century. Our Lutheran fathers rightly concluded: "If error, or even the intimation of error, is admitted in these (minor, incidental) matters, then not even that which pertains to true doctrine is above the suspicion of error."
In other words, they recognized that it is dangerous and well-nigh fatal to attempt the division of Holy Scriptures into that which is doctrinal and inerrant, on the one hand, and that which is incidental and possibly errant, on the other. These Lutheran dogmaticians were only echoing what Martin Luther and St. Augustine and the apostles Peter and Paul and our Lord Jesus Himself had taught before them. For Luther's views of inerrancy see F. Pieper's *Christian Dogmatics*, Vol. I, pp. 276ff.; also John Montgomery's *In Defense of Martin Luther*.

In partial agreement with Pastor Frey we concede that inerrancy does not imply absolute word-for-word agreement between Old Testament passage and its New Testament quotation, or between two parallel accounts of the same incident, etc. Robert Preus has done a service for us in enumerating what he calls "Adjuncts to the Doctrine of Biblical Inerrancy." (*Crisis in Lutheran Theology*, Vol. II, pp. 40ff.) Since this material may not be available to all of us, we present it here.

"1. Inerrancy does not imply verbal exactness of quotations. The New Testament ordinarily quotes the Old Testament according to its sense only.

"2. Inerrancy does not imply verbal or intentional agreement in parallel accounts of the same event. However, it must be clearly recognized that incomplete history or an incomplete presentation of doctrine in a given pericope is not false history or a false presentation.

"3. Scripture is replete with figures of speech, for example, metonymy, metaphor, personification, synecdoche, apostrophe, hyperbole. It should go without saying that figurative language is not errant language.

"4. Scripture uses popular phrases and expressions of its day, for example, bowels of mercy; four corners of the earth. No error is involved in the use of such popular expressions.

"5. In describing the things of nature Scripture does not employ scientifically precise language, but describes and alludes to things phenomenally as they appear to our senses. Phenomenal language also explains why the bat is classified with birds. Many
things in the realm of nature are spoken of in poetic language. ... In none of the above instances is inerrancy threatened or vitiated. ... Because the language is not scientific does not imply that it is not true descriptively.

"6. The various literary forms used by Scripture...

"7. Biblical historiography. ... Chronology and genealogies are not presented in Scripture in the full and orderly manner in which we might present a chronicle or family tree today. ... Genealogies often omit many generations. ..."

"8. There is often a sensus plenior in Scripture pericopes in the sense of 1 Peter 1:10-12. ... We hold only to a profounder and sometimes more distinct sense than the writer may have perceived as he expressed himself. ..."

"9. Pseudepigrapha. Pseudonymity in the sense of one writer pretending to be another in order to secure acceptance of his own work is illicit and not compatible with inerrancy. ... Pseudonymity is deliberate fraud. ..."

"10. Etymologies in Scripture are often according to sound and not (obviously) according to modern linguistic analysis. This fact does not affect inerrancy. ..."

"11. The inerrancy and the authority of Scripture are inseparably related. ... Without inerrancy the sola scriptura principle cannot be maintained or practiced. An erring authority for all Christian doctrine (like an erring Word of God) is an impossible and impracticable contradictio in adjecto.

"12. ... Scripture is autopistos, that is to say, we are to believe its utterances simply because Scripture, the Word of God, makes these utterances (inerrancy is always to be accepted on faith!), and we are to believe without the need of any corroborating evidence. ... Scripture is anapodeiktos, that is, self-authenticating. It brings its own demonstration, the demonstration of the Spirit and of power. Again no corroborating evidence is necessary or sought for. ..."

If Pastor Frey had gone no further than R. Preus in defining and limiting inerrancy, we would not want to charge him with harming Christ's Church. But he does go further, and we therefore do accuse him of using "good words and fair speeches" (Rom. 16:18) to deceive the
public. For he answers his own question by saying that the Bible is inerrant, whereas in fact his position is that the Bible is errant, that "it contains faulty science, inaccurate quotations, and various discrepancies" (p. 42). He, of course, defends his position by saying that "inerrancy does not mean an absence of all inaccuracies and discrepancies, but that the Bible says what it intends to say and what it intends to say corresponds to fact" (p. 42). This is very cleverly stated. The fact remains, however, that the term inerrancy, as it has historically been used, means the absence of all error.

Inerrancy certainly means more than "that Scripture infallibly achieves its purpose or that Scripture unerringly says what God wants said." (R. Preus, The Theology of Post-Reformation Lutheranism, Vol. I, p. 343) Inerrancy means more than that the Bible is "inerrant in all that it affirms" or that "the Bible contains errors, but teaches none." (Eternity, June 1976, p. 41) Inerrancy means more than that "the Scriptures express what God wants them to say and accomplish what God wants them to do. In this sense and in the fulfillment of this function they are inerrant, infallible, and wholly reliable." (Concordia St. Louis faculty statement of 1960) Inerrancy means more than that "the truths revealed for our faith, doctrine and life" are inerrant, rather than the text of Scripture. (Statement of former ALC President, Dr. Schiotz)

Pastor Frey stresses the intention of Scripture. He says: "Minor discrepancies do not necessarily effect (sic) the truthfulness of the intended message." (p. 43) The problem is that we fallible human beings must then determine what God intended by a certain passage.

Pastor Frey answers on the basis of Jn. 5:39; Jn. 20:30-31; Rom. 15:4; 2 Tim. 3:16-17: "It is the intent of Scripture to bear witness to Christ, to lead us to faith in Him, to give instruction in the things of God, to reveal the way of righteousness, to share with us all that we need know about God's will, to instruct and inspire us for godly living, to give us encouragement and hope, and to assure us of eternal life." (p. 41) It is
Pastor Frey's contention that the purpose of Scripture is "to teach the things of God, to show His relationship to man, to give us the way of life and salvation, and inerrancy should be determined by these intended teachings. ... The fact that the Bible is not correct with respect to every detail does not mean that it contains errors, for the reason that absolute correctness was never the intention." (p. 22)

On this basis many scholars have argued that Christ's virgin birth is not necessarily taught in Scripture, because the statements in Matthew and Luke to that effect are only incidental and not the main thrust or intention of what Matthew and Luke are there teaching.

But how can Pastor Frey speak so freely about errors in the God-breathed Scriptures? Is this not accusing God of lying to us? Pastor Frey does not believe that inspiration necessarily implies "that God eliminated the human capacity to make mistakes." (p. 31) He says that that aspect of inspiration is not directly taught in Scripture, and that the various mistakes and errors in Scripture prove that God did not eliminate the possibility of mistakes by the human authors of Scripture. It is right at this point that the implications of Pastor Frey's false views become apparent. He concedes that God Himself is perfect and cannot lie. He concedes that the Scriptures are breathed out by God. And yet he says that there are errors in Scripture because God used fallible men in the production of Scripture. For all practical purposes then we do not have a definite Word of God at all but only a library of books that "contain" the Word of an infallible God together with the words of fallible men. Instead of starting from the great passages that proclaim the inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible, Pastor Frey begins with the so-called discrepancies and tries to prove from them that inspiration cannot mean that God eliminated the human capacity to make mistakes. How the devil can use Pastor Frey's presentation to undermine our confidence in every teaching of God is plain to see.

But what are the discrepancies that Pastor Frey has found in the Scriptures? We do not want to list all of them here. But there is one discrepancy in particular,
according to Pastor Frey, that cannot be explained away as a copyist's error; that is Matthew's genealogy in chapter one that contradicts Israel's history as contained in Kings and Chronicles. Matthew lists fourteen generations from David to the Babylonian Captivity, whereas the Old Testament lists eighteen generations. Why did Matthew skip four generations? Was he not in error in his listing? P. E. Kretzmann's explanation that "Matthew took up the genealogies just as he found them in the public Jewish repositories, which, though in the main points correct, were yet deficient in some respects" (quoted by Frey) does not altogether satisfy. Arndt's discussion of this alleged discrepancy is more helpful, particularly his statement that "Matthew cannot have been ignorant of the names of the kings whom he does not mention. ... A simple explanation is that he used current genealogical tables, in which, probably for reasons of symmetry, certain names had been dropped." (Does the Bible Contradict Itself?, p. 55) Lenski says that "these three kings are purposely dropped by Matthew for the simple reason that he intends to make the three groups of ancestors comprise the same number of names, namely fourteen." (Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel, p. 30)

Other sections of Pastor Frey's pamphlet deal with alleged conflicts with science, alleged inaccurate quotations, alleged statistical discrepancies, and alleged contradictions in parallel accounts. Since W. Arndt has dealt with almost all of these matters in his two little books, Does the Bible Contradict Itself? and Bible Difficulties, it does not seem necessary here to give an answer to all of these discrepancies listed by Pastor Frey.

We do want to make a concluding comment, however, on Pastor Frey's statement that Martin Luther "freely says that Matthew committed a 'slight error' when he attributed a quotation to Jeremiah instead of Zechariah (Mt. 27:9)." Martin Luther discussed this in his two commentaries on Zechariah (Luther's Works, Vol. 20, pp. 125-126, pp. 321-322).

First of all, with respect to quotations from the Old Testament, Luther correctly says: "The evangelists
do not generally cite testimonies from the prophets word for word. They merely bring out the sense. ... Nothing of the sense has been changed." "It is the custom of all the apostles to do thus: to present the sense of Scripture without such a quarrelsome zeal for the exactness and completeness of the text."

Then Luther gives what he considers a possible answer to the problem of the name of the prophet: "The prophet perhaps had two names" or "Matthew was quoting generally, without any concern for the name of the prophet."**

** W. Arndt presents two other and possibly better solutions to the problem of Jeremiah's name in *Does the Bible Contradict Itself?* The one solution is that Matthew was quoting both Jer. 32:6-15, which refers to the purchase of a field, as well as Zechariah, who makes mention of thirty pieces of silver. Therefore it is in order that he mentions Jeremiah, who is a more prominent prophet than Zechariah. The second solution is that the Jews, in their arrangement of the prophets, placed Jeremiah first, and that thus all the prophets are to be found in Jeremiah, since the name Jeremiah was given to the whole book.

E. Young, in his book, *Thy Word Is Truth*, mentions Arndt's two solutions as well as others. His own view is "that originally the word Zechariah stood in the text, and that sometime very early indeed, the word Jeremiah, by a copyist's error, was substituted for it. Toy, for example, thinks that a copyist may have mistaken one abbreviation for another, writing -iriou instead of -zriou, a solution which is perfectly possible." He says "this is a conceivable solution, because the Syrian translation does not have the word Jeremiah." But he does not press the point, but sensibly says: "One thing, however, is clear. There is no warrant for the assertion that Matthew has made a mistake, that he has simply attributed to Jeremiah what as a matter of fact was actually from Zechariah. How glib such an objection is! It sounds convincing only to those who have not taken the trouble to study carefully the facts. Whether Matthew himself originally wrote Zechariah or Jeremiah, we may not today be able to state with positiveness. However, we may
Then Luther speculates, unwisely, no doubt: "There undoubtedly were with Matthew saintly and learned men, who advised him that the Scripture which he cited was in Zechariah, not in Jeremiah. Admonished by their advice, he could have corrected that slight error, had he wished or had he thought it important."

But the question did not really interest Luther, and he spent very little time on it. "There is no reason for us to bother ourselves with these and similar difficulties. After all, the life and sum of our faith do not lie in them. Those people who labor over nonessential matters of this sort are more than mad. Yet this is one thing which the prophets of our day try to do when they read Scriptures for the purpose of searching out texts like this which they can use as the handle and material of debate and controversy."

And this is exactly what Pastor Frey and others like him have done: they have searched for texts that can prove their opinion that the Bible contains errors, instead of clinging to God's own promise that He does not lie and that the Scriptures are His Word. Luther says: "Whoever likes idle strife, let him go on questioning; he will find that he is doing more questioning than answering."

To be sure, Martin Luther had problems understanding various passages of Scripture, even as we all do. But it is clear that he would have regarded Pastor Frey's efforts as misguided. "It is senseless to imitate the foolhardy geniuses who immediately shout that an obvious error has been committed whenever such a difficulty arises. ... As yet I have no real answer for this question. ... It is the Holy Spirit alone who knows and understands all things." (Luther's Works, Vol. 2, p. 238)
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state with assurance that, whichever word he wrote, he wrote the truth. There is a certain sense in which it may be said that the quotation is from Jeremiah; likewise there is a sense in which it may be said to have come from Zechariah. There is no error here." (Thy Word Is Truth, pp. 174-175)
How Should We Then Live? The Rise and Decline of Western Thought and Culture, by Francis A. Schaeffer (Old Tappan, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1976). 288 pp. $12.95. (A study guide and ten-episode film series are also available.)

The reader's first reaction, after noting the subtitle of this volume, might well be: How can anyone presume to survey so large a subject in a single volume of this size? In an early note, however, the author puts the reader somewhat at ease by indicating the intended scope and purpose: "In no way does this book make a pretense of being a complete chronological history of Western culture. ... This book is, however, an analysis of key moments in history which have formed our present culture, and the thinking of the people who brought these moments to pass. This study is made in the hope that light may be shed upon the major characteristics of our age and that solutions may be found to the myriad of problems which face us as we look toward the end of the twentieth century." (p. 17)

There can be doubt that the author has done his homework prior to writing. The book, according to advertisements, represents "the culmination of 40 years of intensive intellectual inquiry." Dr. Schaeffer is indeed one of the most scholarly and prolific writers among contemporary evangelicals. A select bibliography extends over no fewer than eight pages at the end of the volume and is offered "in the spirit of a responsible declaration of [the author's] immediate sources." The topical index which precedes covers fifteen pages and contains hundreds of entries from the areas of history, philosophy, theoretical and applied sciences, religion, political science, economics, sociology, and the arts.

In perusing this book, the reviewer was reminded more than once of Satan's original temptation in the garden: "Ye shall be as gods." (Genesis 3:5) He was successful then in turning man's desires away from God to man himself, and he has been steering fallen mankind down the same humanistic path ever since. If anyone desires
to become more familiar with humanism, religious and secular, as it has manifested itself in the history of Western civilization, this is one book which he can read with understanding and profit. Compare these summary statements, selected from the early chapters:

"Nevertheless, the pristine Christianity set forth in the New Testament gradually became distorted. A humanistic element was added: Increasingly, the authority of the church took precedence over the teaching of the Bible. And there was an ever-growing emphasis on salvation as resting on man's meriting the merit of Christ, instead of on Christ's work alone. While such humanistic elements were somewhat different in content from the humanistic elements of the Renaissance, the concept was essentially the same in that it was man taking to himself that which belonged to God. (p. 32)

"Beginning from man alone, Renaissance humanism — and humanism ever since — has found no way to arrive at universals or absolutes which give meaning to existence and morals. (p. 55)

"... it became increasingly clear that the sort of human anatomy that many of the Renaissance humanists had in mind referred exclusively to the non-Christian Greco-Roman world. Thus Renaissance humanism steadily evolved toward modern humanism — a value system rooted in the belief that man is his own measure, that man is autonomous, totally independent." (p. 60)

Dr. Schaeffer begins his historical survey with the Romans, and covers these topics in order: Ancient Rome; the Middle Ages; the Renaissance; the Reformation (two chapters); the Enlightenment; the Rise of Modern Science; the Breakdown in Philosophy and Science; Modern Philosophy and Modern Theology; Modern Art, Music, Literature, and Films; Our Society; Manipulation and the New Elite; and the Alternatives. The reader is swept along through a myriad of details, and yet his interest does not flag, because of the evident importance of the subject which is being treated and the unifying purpose of the author. Many illustrations serve to hold his attention, as well.
It is inevitable that some viewpoints of the reader will be illuminated or altered by Dr. Schaeffer's frequently penetrating analysis. Countless world travelers have, for example, viewed with awe the sculptures of Michelangelo in the great room of the Academy in Florence. But have they, Christians included, always recognized the thoroughly humanistic spirit that dominates this art? "Here we see on either side Michelangelo's statues of men 'tearing themselves out of the rock.' These were sculpted between 1519 and 1536. They make a real humanistic statement: Man will make himself great. Man as Man is tearing himself out of the rock. Man by himself will tear himself out of nature and free himself from it. Man will be victorious. ... As we go past these men tearing themselves out of the rock, we come finally, at the focal point of the room, to the magnificent statue of David (1504). But let us notice that David was not the Jewish David of the Bible. David was simply a title. Michelangelo knew his Judaism, and in the statue the figure is not circumcised. We are not to think of this as the biblical David but as the humanistic ideal. Man is great! ... The David was the statement of what the humanistic man saw himself as being tomorrow! In this statue we have man waiting with confidence in his own strength for the future. Even the disproportionate size of the hands [almost grotesquely large] says that man is powerful. ... Humanism was standing in its proud self and the David stood as a representation of that." (p. 71f.)

Such optimistic humanism, that man can by his own reason and native resources improve himself and the world, dominated Renaissance thought and art. The experiences of the succeeding half-millennium — most of the aspirations of man remain unfulfilled! — have not eliminated the humanism, but they have altered its mood significantly. Dr. Schaeffer shows that the humanism of our own day is profoundly pessimistic, with fragmented man striving in manifold ways to find meaning and purpose in life, but without success. The twin goals of modern man, both goals intellectually and spiritually unsatisfying, have become peace and prosperity — peace, as the undisturbed opportunity to pursue one's personal desires; prosperity, as the piling up of all the good things in
life that one can possibly obtain. With such secular, utilitarian goals, man is in danger of losing, not only his eternal soul, but his temporal freedoms as well. For he will accept sociological engineering, political manipulation, and even authoritarian government, if only he can continue to pursue his "own thing."

Most of Dr. Schaeffer's evaluations and conclusions are theologically sound. But at times his Reformed presuppositions manifest themselves. He includes in the term "image of God" also man's rationality and creative strivings, and therefore speaks of the Fall as resulting in a deformed, rather than a lost, image. "It is not only Christians who can paint with beauty, nor for that matter only Christians who can love or have creative stirrings. Even though the image is now contorted, people are made in the image of God. This is who people are, whether or not they know or acknowledge it." (p. 97)

Similarly, one finds in the author a typically Reformed desire to structure government according to Biblical and even Christian principles. He would like to see the Bible made the lawbook of the land, if not literally, at least indirectly. He describes with approval Paul Robert's mural Justice Lifts the Nations, with Justice unblindfolded and pointing her sword downward toward a book on which is written "The Law of God" (p. 106), and adds: "To whatever degree a society allows the teaching of the Bible to bring forth its natural conclusions, it is able to have form and freedom in society and government." (p. 110) While we indeed recognize the Scriptural truth that "righteousness exalteth a nation" (Proverbs 14:34), we must affirm that human reason, the natural knowledge of God's law, and the power of the sword—not the revealed Word of God—are the basic principles for secular government.

There are also a number of historical interpretations which one must question, either for what they say or fail to say. For example, the author states that "Wy-cliffe's and Huss's views were the basic views of the Reformation which came later." (p. 80) It does not appear, however, that either of these precursors of the Reformation arrived at the full and adequate understanding of
the Scriptural concept of grace demonstrated later by Luther. Again, he affirms that "the Reformers [plural] accepted the Bible as the Word of God in all that it teaches." (p. 81f.) Such an assertion ought to be qualified by adding that Zwingli and Calvin frequently failed to follow the *sola* Scriptura principle in their theological endeavors. And, while it is true that Luther's role in the Peasant Wars of 1525 may, in retrospect, be found to be lacking somewhat in moderation, Schaeffer's statement regarding "Luther's unbalanced position in regard to the peasant wars" seems overdrawn.

While there is no overt promotion of millenialism in the book, the author apparently hold to a pre-milenial belief: "Many modern performances often place it [the Hallelujah Chorus] at the end as a musical climax, but Handel followed the Bible's teaching exactly and placed it at that future historic moment when the Bible says Christ will come back to rule upon the earth." (p. 92)

What is the way out of the dilemma in which man has placed himself by his alienation from God and His Word? Dr. Schaeffer sees only two alternatives for society in the present flow of events — either an imposed order, or a return to Christian values. To promote the second of these, he makes these proposals: 1) Christians must steadfastly avoid an existential methodology by which the Bible and its truths are placed into a sphere which is separate from the world and from the flow of history. They must regard the Bible as containing absolutes by which culture, the state, and society can be judged and helped. 2) Christians must, moreover, be active, individually and collectively, in promoting a Scriptural world view, so as to influence society in every possible way. And 3) they must continue to speak out and act against abuses in the areas of race and the noncompassionate use of wealth, but must raise their voices also against the special danger of our age — the rise of authoritarian government. "Here," the author concludes, "is a sentence to memorize: To make no decision in regard to the growth of authoritarian government is already a decision for it." (p. 257)
There is little doubt that many of the readers of this Journal are disturbed by the political trends of our day, and as citizens of this country they have both a right and a duty to speak out against them. But as Christians, as members of Christ's Church here on earth, we have a far more important role to play—a role which Dr. Schaeffer should, in the opinion of this reviewer, have emphasized more than he did. This role was well expressed by John H. C. Fritz in a tract, "The Greatest Need of Our Country," published 51 years ago: "The greatest need of our country is that the old Gospel be preached. Just as soon as the churches which have departed from the old Gospel will get back to the old Gospel, they will not only be doing what they ought to do, but will also be doing our country a real service. In the very measure in which the Gospel will be preached, in that measure shall we have Christian people; and in the measure in which we shall have Christian people, in that measure our country will be better off than it is to-day."

C. Kuehne