

Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

LEHRE UND WEHRE

MAGAZIN FUER EV.-LUTH. HOMILETIK

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY-THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. VII

November, 1936

No. 11

CONTENTS

	Page
Walther, a Christian Theologian. Th. Engelder	801
Ein Gutachten des seligen Dr. F. Pieper ueber Polygamie..	816
Der Schriftgrund fuer die Lehre von der satisfactio vicaria. P. E. Kretzmann	824
The Norm and Rule of Doctrine in the Christian Church before the Reformation. Theo. Dierks	826
Dispositionen ueber die erste von der Synodalkonferenz angenommene Evangelienreihe	847
Outlines on the Eisenach Epistle Selections	855
Miscellanea	858
Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches	863
Book Review. — Literatur	873

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

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

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

Published for the
Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States
CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.



ARCHIVES

Miscellanea.

Notes on Baptizein.

Language has its accepted usage whether contained in a manuscript which subsequently was proved and accepted as canonical or whether it occurs in writings that naturally must remain uncanonical. While the New Testament Apocrypha and uncanonical gospels are not decisive and authoritative in matters of doctrine and practise, their usage of the Greek of their period is nevertheless of the greatest importance.

When Drs. Grenfell and Hunt, digging in the Fayoum for the Egypt Exploration Society, found their famous "Fragment of an Uncanonical Gospel" (The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, No. 840) in December 1905, they found a leaf rich in philological import. The Oxford University Press found the papyrus of sufficient importance to publish it in a special brochure apart from the voluminous *Graeco-Roman Memoirs V*.

The unknown author of the fragment used a small, not very regular uncial hand, round and upright, a type of writing pointing to a late fourth-century date. He uses some contractions common to theological manuscripts of that period, *viz.*, $\overline{\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma} = \overline{\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\tau\omicron\varsigma}$, $\overline{\delta\delta} = \overline{\Delta\alpha\upsilon\iota\delta}$, and $\overline{\sigma\omega\rho} = \overline{\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho}$. The text is practically complete with the exception of one of the lower corners, but here the lacunae admit of satisfactory if not certain, restoration.

The burden of this fascinating text is concerned with a conversation between the Savior (as Jesus is called throughout the fragment) and a chief priest, which takes place in the Temple. The Savior takes His disciples with Him into the "place of purification." Here they are met by a Pharisee. This chief priest and Pharisee reproaches them for having neglected to perform the necessary ceremonies of ablution before entering the sacred place. In the ensuing dialog Jesus asks the priest whether he is pure, and the latter answers by telling of the different purificatory rites which he had himself observed. Jesus' reply is crushing in that it contrasts outward with inward purity, the external bathing ($\lambda\omicron\upsilon\tau\rho\delta\acute{\omicron}\nu$ and $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ are used synonymously) prescribed by Jewish ritual with the inward cleansing which His disciples had received in the waters of eternal life. Before the speech is concluded the fragment breaks off.

In its general outline the episode described in the fragment resembles Matt. 15, 1—20, and Mark 7, 1—23, where the Pharisees reproach the Lord because the disciples did not wash their hands when they ate bread, and are strongly rebuked. Clearly the present fragment belongs to a narrative covering the same ground as the canonical gospels, even more so than the "Fragment of a Lost Gospel," published together with the "New Sayings of Jesus" (Pp. Oxyr. 655), where a similar situation is discussed.

It will be remembered that in Luke 11, 38 the Pharisee was astonished that Jesus had not "baptized" Himself ($\acute{\epsilon}\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\theta\eta$) before meat; while Matt. 15, 2 says: $\omicron\upsilon\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \nu\acute{\iota}\pi\tau\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha\varsigma\ \delta\tau\alpha\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\acute{\iota}\omega\sigma\omicron\nu$. There is little, if any, distinction between $\nu\acute{\iota}\pi\tau\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ and $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ in these passages. Mark (7, 3) records that the Pharisees, except they wash their

hands off, eat not (ἐὰν μὴ νίψονται τὰς χεῖρας). The subsequent verse replaces *wash* with *baptize*: except they wash (ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται, although it must be stated that Nestle here prefers a different reading), they eat not, and it is added that the Jews observe the custom to “baptize” the cups, pots, brazen vessels, and tables. One would run into considerable difficulty by endeavoring to visualize such “baptism” as submersion or immersion.

The fragment before us richly substantiates this usage of the *Koine* so faithfully reproduced in the New Testament and so sanely reflected in the Lutheran mode of baptism. Lines 9—19 of the uncanonical gospel read: “And a certain Pharisee, a chief priest, whose name was Levi [?], met them and said to the Savior, Who gave Thee leave to walk in this place of purification and to see these holy vessels when Thou hast not washed 1) nor yet Thy disciples have washed their feet? But defiled, Thou hast walked in this Temple, which is a pure place, wherein no other man walks except he has washed himself.” (. . . μήτε ΛΟΥΣΑΜΕΝΩ μήτε μὴν τῶν μαθητῶν σου τοὺς πόδας ΒΑΠΤΙΣΘΕΝΤΩΝ; . . . ὃν οὐδεὶς ἄλλος εἰ μὴ ΛΟΥΣΑΜΕΝΟΣ).

Again (lines 30—33, 41—44): “The Savior answered and said unto him, Woe, ye blind, who see not; thou hast washed in these running waters wherein dogs and swine have been cast. . . . But I and my disciples, who, thou sayest, have not bathed, have been washed [or dipped] in the waters of eternal life.” (‘Ο σωτὴρ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, οὐαί, τυφλοὶ μὴ ὁρῶντες· σὺ ἘΛΟΥΣΩ τοῦτοις τοῖς χεομένοις ὕδασι ἐν οἷς κύνες καὶ χοῖροι βέβληνται . . . ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ μου οὓς λέγεις μὴ ΒΕΒΑΠΤΙΣΘΑΙ ΒΕΒΑΜΜΕΘΑ ἐν ὕδασι ζωῆς αἰωνίου.)

The fragment interchangeably employs λούειν, βάπτειν and βαπτίζειν. The first is used literally or merely ceremonially for washing or bathing the body. It is the λουτρόν, the bath (the water, not the vessel), regardless of whether one sits in it, submerges, takes merely a shower, or a sponge bath. The second verb, here used parallel to the first, usually means to dip, especially as in dyeing. (Cf. δίβαφα, twice-dyed garments; also Rev. 19, 13: ἱμάτιον βεβαμμένον αἵματι.) Βάπτειν is a less technical word than βαπτίζειν, but there is no real distinction between the two terms here. It is interesting to note, however, that the idea of a change, *viz.*, a change of color, as in dyeing, is implied by βάπτειν and connoted by βαπτίζειν; for the washing of the water with the word certainly changes the crimson or scarlet to a white, something which no human dye can accomplish. But God’s dye and His chemistry is different from cold human science. Third, βαπτίζειν has been used specifically and technically for ceremonial dipping and submerging regardless of whether by immersion or affusion.

Thus the *usus loquendi* in the fragment from the Fayoum corresponds with the use of these verbs for washing and bathing in the Scriptures. Βαπτίζειν signifies *any* mode of washing (Mark 7, 4), and in its technical Christian sense, on good apostolic authority, a washing from sin. It may also be observed that Christian Baptism does not wash the body, but is a salutary washing of the soul (1 Pet. 3, 21). The power of Baptism is

1) Italics my own throughout.

not hidden in the water; so why should *much* water have more power than a little water? Such broad understanding of these ablutionary terms in Scripture is in complete agreement with the accepted usage of these verbs in the Greek of the Apostolic and Post-apostolic Age.²⁾

RICHARD T. DU BRAU.

The Strange Notion of a "Double Soteriology."

In a number of articles which have recently appeared we have again been amazed at the peculiar conception which certain theologians have concerning the term which they coined—"double soteriology." The meaning of this strange term seems to be this, that both Jesus and St. Paul taught two ways of salvation, one by works, the other by grace. The Sermon on the Mount is said to represent the first way of salvation; the teaching of the atonement is said to be the second way of salvation. The chief difficulty seems to be connected with the statement of Jesus: "This do, and thou shalt live," Luke 10, 28. Apparently the critics do not see that Jesus is presenting an "impossibility." If man were without sin, he certainly could and would keep the Law and thereby earn salvation. But this is an impossibility as man is now constituted since the Fall. And the words of Jesus bring home this truth with great emphasis. And the very same point is made by St. Paul again and again, especially in the Letter to the Galatians. If any fact stands out clearly in this letter it is that of the utter hopelessness to attain to salvation by one's own works. Whenever the Bible speaks of a way of works, it is for the purpose of showing man his utter inability to live up to the demands of the Law. Hence the notion of a "double soteriology" is utterly foreign to the spirit of the Gospel.

P. E. K.

Children's "Programs" for Christmas.

Recent trends in the matter of presenting the Christmas-story during the holy season show two peculiar aberrations. On the one hand there seems to be some danger of overemphasizing pageantry in the Church, so that the message of Christmas itself is not given the prominent position which it must retain in the Lutheran Church. In other words, people come in large numbers to enjoy the pageant, but the attendance at the regular service of preaching is small.

On the other hand there is a tendency to overlook the fact that the Lutheran Church has ever emphasized the congregation as such in attendance at any church service. As long as our Synod is in existence, we have had children's services at Christmas. But while the children are given prominence in this service, we must not forget that the entire congregation ought to take part in the sacrificial element of worship. The liturgy should take into account the full treasures of Christian forms and the uses of our Church. We have certain psalms which have from olden days been used for Christmas, and we have prayers and poems which are intended for adults as well as for children. Then, according to the well-known dictum of Luther, we should have a sermon, even though this be short.

2) Cp. Vol. III, 214.

In small churches it may be feasible to have a catechization, with individual children answering. But in large churches much of the blessing accruing from the catechization is lost because the individuals in the audience cannot hear clearly.

Another point that must be kept in mind is this, that everything which savors of a performance and places the individual into prominence has no place in a church service.

According to the best usage of the Lutheran Church very many of the Christmas "programs" now used in church-school and Sunday-school services should have been staged in the parish-house or school-hall. All pastors who really wish to follow the best traditions of Lutheran usage will select such liturgical Christmas services as will stress the participation of the entire congregation in such a service of worship and praise. We have a number of such services now available, and it will certainly be a step forward if we refuse to accept material which is not based upon sound liturgical study.

P. E. K.

Our Puritan Ancestry.

"We Reformed Episcopalians, along with the other evangelical Episcopalians, of whom a remnant remains, and along with orthodox Congregationalists, who have not altogether disappeared, are lineal descendants of the Puritans of the days of Elizabeth and James the First. They were members of the Church of England who wanted that Church to become as fully Reformed and Protestant as the Presbyterian Church of Scotland and the Reformed churches of Switzerland, France, Holland, and Germany. Their austerity, which in popular thinking was their chief mark, which actually was only incidental and was one of the characteristics of the times, we have lost — all of us, with rare exceptions. In their revulsion from Romanism they were not free from fanaticism, and some of their descendants, it may be in lesser degree, show the same trait. But historically they are our spiritual ancestors, and we have reason to be proud of our genealogy if we are true to the teachings of the Word of God.

"The political compromises of Elizabeth in her ordering of the revised *Book of Common Prayer* at the outset of her reign barred the way equally to the reestablishment of the Church of Rome and to the establishing of a truly Reformed Church in her kingdom. She knew that to return to the reformation movement of the short reign of Edward VI would alienate the preponderant Roman Catholic element in the Church, and to follow the lead of Romish Mary would disrupt the Church. More martyrdoms would hasten rather than block the impending schism. The *Prayer-book* was so amended and rubricated as to placate both parties, and at least outwardly and temporarily it succeeded. Ever since, the Church of England and in later turn the Protestant Episcopal Church have had outward unity and inward strife.

"But the reformation movement in England soon took on new life and activity. The reformers were dubbed 'Puritans.' The term was one of sarcasm and scorn; it deserved a fairer and truer significance. It led to separation from the Romish-Reformed Church of England. The Independents were the children of the Puritans; the Pilgrims at our

Plymouth Rock were the grandchildren; the Puritans of Salem and Boston soon also became Independents—Congregationalists. The evangelicals in the Church of England and, later, in the Protestant Episcopal Church and, still later, those who organized and continued the Reformed Episcopal Church have simply sustained the Puritan principles. We fight against Popery, prelacy, priestcraft; *against all doctrines of saving grace through the vehicle of the Sacraments*; against ritualism; we stand for episcopacy without autocracy, the liturgy without ritualism, *immediate saving grace through faith*, the Bible as the infallible Word of God. We belong to the diminishing company of stalwart modern Puritans.”

The above paragraphs are taken from the *Episcopal Recorder*, published in the interest of the Reformed Episcopal Church. In the summary of principles the points which we have underscored would seem particularly valuable in characterizing this church-body. P. E. K.

Genesis Upheld.

When the sixth annual Saginaw Bible Conference was conducted last May, one of the chief speakers was Dr. Arthur I. Brown, who is described as a Canadian scientist, surgeon, and Bible-expositor. From the newspaper reports of his addresses we quote the following: “No book has so taxed the minds of ancient and modern scholars as this—Genesis. It is concerned with the most mysterious of questions—the origin of the universe. Early chapters of this sublime record are not myths nor allegories, but accurate history and absolute science. No one has ever been able to discover any disagreement between Genesis and a proved science. Genesis proves modern science to be true. The Bible needs no corroboration from man. God is the Author, and His writing is infallible truth. The reason that Genesis has been considered by some uninformed people to be a sort of fairy-talk, is because evolution has been thought to be the method by which things animate and inanimate came into being rather than by fiat creation. All facts go to show that ‘in the beginning God created’ is the only logical and scientific solution of the problem of origins.

“Evolution is the world’s most colossal hoax. There is a popular idea fostered by the confident, but unsupported assertions of the ardent protagonists of this baseless theory that creation has been relegated to the limbo of myth and superstition by the discoveries of modern science. This is very far from the truth. The pendulum of scientific thinking, especially on the continent of Europe, is swinging away from the concept of a bestial origin for man. Many of the foremost scientists in the world, like Deperret, Carazzi, Valetton, Fleischmann, the zoologist of Erlangen University, Germany, Douglas Dewar, and others, are now unequivocally renouncing any belief in evolution. And this not because of any religious bias, but simply because the theory has collapsed and has failed to prove its absurd claims.” This is plain and cheering testimony. A.

