

Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

LEHRE UND WEHRE
MAGAZIN FUER EV.-LUTH. HOMILETIK
THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY-THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. IX

July, 1938

No. 7

CONTENTS

	Page
A Course in Lutheran Theology. Th. Engelder	481
Kleine Danielstudien. L. Fuerbringer	495
Sermon Study on Acts 5:34-42. Th. Laetsch	506
Miscellanea	519
Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches	530
Book Review. — Literatur	553

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

Does the First Part of This Story Repeat Itself Elsewhere?

Rev. W. Peck, S. T. D., relates this story in the *Living Church*: The new rector of a parish in a certain small English town was deeply troubled to find the congregation divided into two warring sections. He tried to discover what were the real issues and principles dividing them and came to the conclusion that there were none. What divided the church was the jealousy of the two leading families, the family of Alderman Bloggins and the family of Councilor Scroggins. [These are not the real names.] There were two camps. Anything proposed by a Blogginsite was at once ridiculed and opposed by the Scrogginsites. If the Scrogginsites produced a policy, the Blogginsites immediately provided the opposition. There was hatred between the two families. The rector saw them on Sundays, the alderman and the councilor looking thunderous and their wives exchanging glances full of lightning. And this went on until the rector's soul was seething within him, and he stood up in his pulpit and preached a sermon about it.

It was a terrific effort. Of course, he mentioned no names; but he simply let fly and lashed about him until his wife, sitting in the rectory pew, feared that the outraged tribes of Bloggins and Scroggins would unite in the slaughter of her too daring husband.

But nothing of the sort occurred. On the contrary, Alderman Bloggins met the rector on High Street on Monday morning and shook his hand warmly. "Rector," he said, "I want to thank you for that wonderful sermon. It was marvelous. I only hope it went home to the person for whom it was intended. It ought to do him a world of good." The rector was flabbergasted, and the alderman had gone before he could recover the power of speech. He went down High Street in a sort of dream, out of which he was awakened by the voice of Councilor Scroggins, who was standing at the door of his shop. "Rector," said the Councilor, "that was a magnificent sermon you preached yesterday. You gave it to him hot and strong. I hope he took it to heart."

The rector felt that earthquakes were occurring in his soul. He dared not trust himself to speak. He went home and told his wife about it. Half an hour later she said, "I've been thinking."

The following day the rector called upon Alderman Bloggins and raised the subject of church renovation. "How much do you suppose Scroggins will give?" asked the alderman. "I should think," said the rector, looking tremendously thoughtful, "about 20 pounds." "Paltry!" said the alderman. "I'll give you 50." "Thanks," said the rector and went off to Councilor Scroggins to raise with him the subject of church renovation. "How much do you suppose Bloggins will give?" asked the Councilor. "I think," said the rector, "that he will be good for 50 pounds." "Miserable!" said Scroggins. "I'll give you 100." "Thanks," said the rector and went back to Bloggins. "Scroggins," he announced, "is giving 100. I thought you would be glad to hear it." "Oh, indeed!" said

Bloggins. "Simply his confounded pride! But I'll teach him. I'll give you 150." "Thanks," said the rector and went back to Scroggins. "Bloggins," he said, "is giving 150. I thought you would like to know how well the fund is doing." "Just ostentation!" said Scroggins. "But we can't have him boasting about his generosity. I'll give you 200." And thus the strange competition continued throughout the week.

The following Sunday the rector, having preached about the importance of making friends of the Mammon of unrighteousness, invited Bloggins and Scroggins home to supper. It was a desperately brave deed. Each of the two men was absurdly embarrassed at the presence of the other. The rector and his wife seemed very cheerful, but the guests were dumb. They did not know that they were just about to get the shock of their lives. After supper the rector took them into his study and gave them chairs. Then, the light of battle in his eye, he opened fire upon them without warning.

"You two men," he said, "and your families have disgraced the church long enough with your jealousy and spite. You made the late rector's life a misery, and you have nearly driven me mad. But during the past week, for the sake of the hatred you bear each other, you have promised between you to contribute the sum of 700 pounds for the renovation of the church which you have defiled with your wretched feuds. I will accept your money upon one condition. You two sinners will shake hands here and now, and then you will kneel down and repeat together the General Confession. (You can do that without breaking the seal!) Then perhaps the renovation of the church will mean something. But, understand, I will not hear a word of self-defense from either of you." The clock in the rector's study ticked solemnly for some awful moments. Then Bloggins and Scroggins, both looking shy and rather absurd, stood up and shook hands. Then they dutifully knelt down and said with the rector the General Confession; and the rector pronounced absolution. They rose from their knees and carefully dusted their trousers. "That is splendid!" said the rector. "And now you must go and tell the good news to your wives." E.

Argument against the Individual Communion Cup from the Ex Autou

It has been asked whether the argument against the individual Communion cup from Christ's command "Drink ye all of it" (Matt. 26:27: "*Piete ex autou pantes*"; Mark 14:23: "*Epion ex autou pantes*") is valid. The argument from the *ex autou* may in substance be stated as follows: "The expression *ex autou* means: 'Drink ye of the same cup.' In these words therefore our Savior commands the use of *one and the same* cup, so that the use of the individual cup at the celebration of the Lord's Supper is *directly anti-Scriptural*." In discussing this timely topic, we should like to stress the following points:

1. In our literature the right of a church to use the individual cup has been defended. Dean Fritz, for example, in his excellent *Pastoral Theology*, writes with regard to the use of the individual cup as follows (p. 149): "There is no dogmatical reason why the individual Communion cup should not be used. In many churches two cups are used; why

not more? But there is also no good reason why the old practise of using the common Communion cup should be discontinued. Sanitary reasons do not absolutely forbid it; the danger of infection is very remote." 2. No exegete of recognized ability and trustworthiness has ever drawn the conclusion from the *ex autou* which some contenders actually have drawn. Their interpretation is an exegetical anomaly, violating all sound hermeneutical canons governing Scriptural exegesis. 3. The meaning of the *ex autou* is not: "Drink ye out of the same cup" but, as our Authorized Version, and every other correct translation for all that (cf. Luther's "Trinket alle daraus"), reads: "of it." In other words, there is no special emphasis on the *ex autou*, as if the expression meant to say: "Drink ye all of this *one and the same cup*." Those who interpret the words thus commit the offense of *eisegesis*, or of misused explanation, which forces upon the text what the text itself does not say. "Of the same [cup]" would require *ek tou autou*. 4. The fact that Christ here speaks in the singular: "Drink ye all of it," does not argue for the use of *one common* Communion cup, since, as the context shows, the singular *autou* is required by the singular *potaerion*, immediately preceding. In view of the singular *potaerion* Christ simply could not have said "*ex autoon*" unless He wanted to violate the genius of Greek language. 5. If the *ex autou* must be taken in a bare, literal sense, then our Lutheran churches erred in using two or more larger Communion cups at the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Yet this custom has been quite generally observed and acknowledged as correct in our Church. 6. If the *ex autou* must be taken in a bare, literal sense, then, moreover, all communicants till the end of time must use the *original cup* which Christ used at the first Communion; for if the *ex autou* is *demonstrative and exclusive*, then we are compelled to go back to the same cup which Christ had in His hand when He spoke the words of institution. 7. If bare literalness in this case is to apply, then, further, we have no assurance that we are right in using Communion *wafers* (*Hostien*), since Christ says: "Take, eat; this (*touto*) is My body." The *touto* is as singular as is the *ex autou*, and if the latter compels us to use but *one cup*, then the former must equally force us to use but *one bread*, especially since St. Paul, in 1 Cor. 10:17, emphasizes the *one bread* as symbolizing the unity of the body of believers. He says: "For *one bread* (*heis artos*), *one body* (*hen sooma*) we, the many, are; for we all partake of the *one bread* (*ek tou henos artou*)." This the *Weimar Bible* explains in its simple but excellent way: "Also auch wir Christen, die wir von *einem* Brot im heiligen Abendmahl essen und von *einem* Kelch trinken, werden dadurch *ein* Leib und machen *eine* Kirche, *eine* Gemeinde." That is to say: "So also we Christians, who in the Lord's Supper eat of *one bread* and drink of *one cup*, thereby become *one body* and constitute *one Church, one congregation*." But if the use of the *many wafers* does not destroy the symbolized Communion unity, then neither is it necessary to retain the *one Communion cup*. The parallelism here is complete, and what holds of the *one bread* holds also of the *one cup*. In short, the argument from the *ex autou* attempts to prove too much and therefore proves nothing, while it creates immense exegetic and dogmatic difficulties.

When we say all this, we do not mean to urge the use of the indi-

vidual cup. Whether a congregation wishes to do so or not depends on its own decision; for also with regard to this adiaphoron it may exercise its Christian liberty, provided no offense is given. Personally, for many reasons, we prefer the common Communion cup. However, as we must attack every attempt to say less than Holy Scripture does, so also we must combat every attempt to say more than Holy Scripture does. In other words, it is offensive and unchristian to make that a wrong which Scripture itself does not declare to be wrong. The principle of Christian liberty must never be violated.

J. T. M.

Vom Kanzelton

In den „Pastoralblättern“ (Herausgeber D. Erich Stange; Verlag: E. Ludwig Ungelenk, Dresden=Leipzig), und zwar in dem Februarheft für 1938, findet sich ein lehrreicher Artikel über den Kanzelton. Die Hauptabschnitte drucken wir hier ab. Der Verfasser, D. E. Haack, schreibt:

Der Kanzelton ist leider häufig genug zu finden, wie jeder weiß, der, wie der Verfasser, jahrzehntelang ein Predigerseminar geleitet oder viele Predigten und Prediger gehört hat. Er erklingt in den allermannigfachsten, schwer aufzuzählenden und zu beschreibenden Variationen. Es ist ergötzlich, zu lesen, wie Spurgeon, „der König der Prediger“, in seinen interessanten „Vorlesungen in meinem Predigerseminar“ den Kanzelton der hochkirchlichen Geistlichkeit Englands schildert und verspottet, wie er in allen möglichen Abwandlungen, „vom Tschiep! Tschiep! des Buchstufens bis zum Brüllen der Kinder Wafans“, zu hören ist. Sein Spott trifft auch manchen Prediger in Deutschland. Der eine meint, ohne Rücksichtnahme auf Ort und Raumberhältnisse, stets alle Register seines Stimmorgans bis zur höchsten Lautgrenze ziehen zu müssen, und quält und ermüdet so Ohren und Herzen der Zuhörer. Ein anderer hält es mit einem übertriebenen Modulieren durch alle Stufen der Dynamik hindurch vom fortissimo bis zum flüsternden piano und Verschlucken der Endsilben und erschwert so schon das äußere Verständnis seiner Rede seitens der zuhörenden Gemeinde. Wieder ein anderer hat sich eine gemachte Salbung angewöhnt oder hält ein dröhnendes Pathos für den angemessenen Ausdruck christlicher Glaubensfestigkeit und Parrhesie der Rede und erweckt so den Schein der Unehlichkeit. Dagegen spricht ein anderer monoton und liest, wie der Protokollführer sein Protokoll, die auswendig gelernte Predigt von dem ins Gedächtnis aufgenommenen Konzept ab. Ein fünfter spricht zwar nicht monoton, aber „isoton“, in denselben Hebungen und Senkungen in den einzelnen Perioden und Sätzen, oft unter Begleitung derselben Gesten. Dieser liebt das langsame, feierliche Tempo eines Trauermarsches und jener das Allegro oder gar Presto in einer Symphonie. Wie ein schäumender Gießbach rauscht seine Rede über die Köpfe seiner Zuhörer dahin. Wer vermag alle die verschiedenen Variationen des Kanzeltons aufzuzählen? Das Gemeinsame bei allen aber ist die größere oder geringere Unnatur, die ihre Stimme auf der Kanzel annimmt im Unterschied von ihrer gewöhnlichen Sprechweise und dem ihnen eigentlich natürlichen Gebrauch und Klang ihrer Stimme.

Man nehme diese und andere in dem Wort „Kanzelton“ zusammengefaßten Fehler des Predigtvortrags nicht zu leicht. Gewiß, manche Gemeinde, besonders auf dem Lande, hat sich so an den Kanzelton ihres Pastors gewöhnt, daß sie sich nicht daran stößt, wenn er sonst nur ein treuer Seel-

forger ist. Die eindrucksvolle, christliche Persönlichkeit und die sonstige Amtsführung des Pfarrers kann ihn [den Kanzelton] unschädlich machen. Aus meinem sechzig Jahre zurückliegenden Universitätsstudium in einer Großstadt erinnere ich mich noch heute, daß eine längst heimgegangene, geweihte Predigerpersönlichkeit trotz ihres wenig wohlklingenden Stimmorgans und mangelhaften Vortrags durch den tiefen, reichen Inhalt ihrer Predigten sonntäglich gerade geförderte Christen, die „mit Ernst Christen sein“ und „mehr haben wollten“, auch aus andern Gemeinden in seine Kirche zog. Wiederum wirkte gleichzeitig ein anderer Geistlicher durch den Lebendigen, natürlichen Vortrag seiner gläubigen Predigten bei bilderreicher, konkreter Sprache mehr auf die große Menge; und auch Fernerstehende halfen stets die große Kirche bis auf den letzten Platz füllen. Und das möchte doch jeder Prediger des göttlichen Wortes. . . .

Der Grundschade des Kanzeltons und die Ursache seiner unerfreulichen Wirkungen ist eben die Unnatur, die ihm anhaftet, daß der Pastor auf der Kanzel anders spricht, als man sonst bei ihm gewohnt ist. Das erweckt den üblen Anschein, als sei das Gesagte bei ihm nicht echt, nicht seine innerste Überzeugung, für die er mit seiner ganzen Persönlichkeit eintritt. Mag es auch nicht so sein, sondern nur so scheinen; aber man urteilt nach diesem Schein, wenn man den Redner nicht genauer kennt, besonders seiner organisierte Zuhörer mit gebildeterem Geschmaç und in unserer Zeit mit ihrem nüchternen Wirklichkeitsinn. Aber auch ein einfacher Bauer klagte mir einmal über die Sprechweise seines Pastors: „Gei vertellt sich dat all süßen.“

Wie kommt es nun zu diesem Fehler? Manche neigen von Natur zu ihm, ohne daß sie es wissen und wollen. Ihre Stimme und Sprache nimmt, wie von selber, einen andern Ton an, wenn sie öffentlich und in dem sakralen Raum der Kirche sprechen sollen. Die erwartungsvoll auf sie gerichteten Augen einer größeren Versammlung, die Feierlichkeit des Gottesdienstes, oft auch Äußerlichkeiten wie die zu große Höhe der Kanzel, die den inneren Kontakt mit der Gemeinde erschweren, auch wohl die sonst nicht gewohnte Amtstracht machen sie befangen, reizen zu besonderen Stimmanövern und machen ihre Rede unnatürlich und maniert, und diese Manier wird dann mehr und mehr zur Angewohnheit, die leider die Eigentümlichkeit hat, sich festzusetzen und zu wachsen, wenn sie nicht von vornherein eine verständnisvolle Kritik findet. Da heißt es: „Principiis obsta; sero medicina paratur.“ . . .

Kritik ist freilich kein Heilmittel. Was gibt es denn für Mittel zur Bekämpfung und Überwindung des fehlerhaften Kanzeltons? Ein doppeltes: ein physiologisches und ein psychologisches. Das physiologische ist ein sachverständiger Sprech- (nicht Sprach-)unterricht. Selbststudium der Phonetik nach einem Buch ist wenig ratsam und wenig Erfolg versprechend. Einerseits ist es zu langweilig. Man ermüdet dabei. Andererseits fehlt dabei das Vorbild für die rechte Lautbildung und die sachverständige Beurteilung der eigenen Übungen darin durch einen andern. Das psychologische Mittel besteht in dem rechten Amtsbewußtsein und der lebendigen Vergegenwärtigung der Forderung des Amtes, der Situation und der Stunde, daß der Prediger sich sagt: Du bist auf der Kanzel kein Redner, der es auf Effekt anlegt und um Beifall wirbt; kein Rezitator, der durch seine Deklamation Eindruck machen will; kein Handwerker, der geschäftsmäßig eine Facharbeit leistet. Du bist der verantwortliche Hirte und Seelsorger der Gemeinde, der sie zu Gott führen und sie auf den Grund- und Eckstein ihres Glaubens

„erbauen, zubereiten, stärken, kräftigen, gründen“ soll, 1 Petr. 5, 10, und um ihre Seelen wirbt, wie der Brautwerber, der *philos tou nymphiou*, Joh. 3, 29. Du bist Botschafter an Christi Statt, der einfach und einfältig die Botschaft ausrichtet, zu der er gesandt wird, 2 Kor. 5, 19—22. Du sollst ein Zeuge Jesu Christi sein, der von ihm zeugt, Joh. 15, 26, und bezeugt, was er gesehen und besähet und betastet hat vom Wort des Lebens, 1 Joh. 1, 1, und der sein Zeugnis nur verdächtig macht, wenn er gekünstelt und un-natürlich spricht. Das hilft gegen den Kanzelton und verhilft zu dem rechten, warmen Herzenston, der von Herzen kommt und zu Herzen geht. A.

The Pledge of Princeton Seminary Professors

Members of the faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary take the following pledge when entering upon their office: "In the presence of God and of the trustees of this seminary I do solemnly and *ex animo* adopt, receive, and subscribe the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of the Presbyterian Church of the United States in America as the confession of my faith or as a summary and just exhibition of that system of doctrine and religious belief which is contained in Holy Scripture and therein revealed by God to man for his salvation; and I do solemnly, *ex animo*, profess to receive the form of government of said Church as agreeable to the inspired Oracles. And I do solemnly promise and engage not to inculcate, teach, or insinuate anything which shall appear to me to contradict or contravene, either directly or impliedly, anything taught in the said Confession of Faith or Catechisms nor to oppose any of the fundamental principles of Presbyterian church government while I shall continue a professor in this seminary." (Cf. *Presbyterian* of December 2, 1937.) A.

Can a Christian be Lost?

A pamphlet bearing this title has so perplexed one of our readers that he submitted it to us for discussion and criticism. What the pamphlet means to defend is of course the Calvinistic doctrine of absolute perseverance, stated by the author in his *Introduction* in the words: "We come in contact with scores of persons who condemn us whole-heartedly when we mention the *eternal security of the 'born-again' one.*" (Italics our own.) What the brochure champions is the old Reformed doctrine that a person once brought to faith can never lose it again. Dr. F. Bente, in his "Historical Introduction to the Symbolical Books" (*Triglot*, p. 200), quotes the Calvinist Jerome Zanchi as having expressed himself on this error as follows: "1. To the elect in this world faith is given by God *only once.* 2. The elect who have once been endowed with true faith . . . can *never again lose faith altogether.* 3. The elect never sin with their whole mind or their entire will. 4. When Peter denied Christ, he indeed lacked the *confession* of the mouth, but not the *faith of the heart.*" This false Calvinistic doctrine of the absolute perseverance of the "born-again" person is as far removed from the Lutheran doctrine of God's gracious Gospel assurance of preserving the believer in faith as is the Calvinistic doctrine of absolute predestination from the Lutheran doctrine of election *in Christ.* In both cases it is the element of *absoluteness* which makes the distinction. We Lutherans do not teach an absolute pre-

destination; neither do we teach an absolute perseverance. It is significant how strenuously Lutheran teachers, even in their *quasi*-popular theological works, opposed this dangerous Reformed error. Conrad Dieterich, for example, in his *Institutiones Catecheticae* (pp. 417 sqq.; translation by Dr. Notz, pp. 358 ff.), quite exhausts the subject, though his *Catechetical Instruction* was intended only for young men in secondary schools of learning. On the one hand, he at great length proves the Scriptural doctrine from clear Bible-passages, and, on the other, he refutes the Calvinistic argumentation, pointing out that the passages which the Calvinists quote for their doctrine (e. g., Ps. 51:12, 13; 111:3 b; Hos. 2:19; Matt. 24:24; John 10:28; 13:1; 14:16; Rom. 11:29; 1 John 3:9, 10; Jude 3) simply do not prove that "faith once bestowed can never again be lost." On the contrary, many clear and unmistakable passages declare that the believer can lose his faith (e. g., Matt. 24:12, 13; Luke 8:13; Rom. 8:13; 1 Tim. 1:5, 6; 1:19; 1 John 2:9; 3:15; 1 Sam. 16:14 [Saul]; 2 Sam. 12 [David]; 1 Kings 11:15, cf. with 3:3; 8:15 [Solomon]; Ex. 32:1ff. [Aaron]; Matt. 26:69, cf. with 16:17 [Peter]; John 20:21 [Thomas]; Gal. 5:4 [the Galatian apostates]; 1 Tim. 1:19; 2 Tim. 2:17; 4:10 [Alexander, Hymenaeus, Philetus, Demas]; etc.). That, of course, the *elect* will not be lost but will be eternally saved, is a truth which Scripture teaches very clearly (John 10:29; Matt. 24:24; etc.). But that is something entirely different from the Reformed doctrine that a Christian cannot again lose his faith. Christians, or believers, certainly can lose their faith, though by God's grace the elect, in case they fall, will be restored to faith and thus finally be saved.

The great trouble with the Calvinists is that, as in other places, so also here they fail to observe the basic difference between the Law and the Gospel and thus mingle the two into each other, thereby producing a *mixtum compositum* which is neither Christian nor comforting. Lutherans, on the other hand, also here rightly distinguish between Law and Gospel; and at the same time they take all Law statements and all Gospel statements at their full face value. When thus Scripture warns the believer against losing his faith through carnal indifference and contempt for God's Word (Matt. 24:12, 13; Luke 8:13; Rom. 8:13; 1 Cor. 10:12; etc.), they take this as *Law-preaching*, addressed to the evil flesh of the Christian, and indeed as a very necessary and real warning, which all Christians must impress upon their Old Adam and which especially the carnally secure must hear and heed. These warnings must not be interpreted to mean that *on God's part* the believer's salvation is uncertain and that therefore he dare not rejoice in the assurance of his salvation (so Romanists and all Pelagianizers); but they do mean that, if believers sow to their flesh, they shall also of the flesh reap corruption. (Cf. Gal. 6:8.) On the other hand, when Scripture comforts the believer with the assurance that the elect will not be lost, that God is faithful to continue the good work which He has begun in the believers (Matt. 24:24; John 10:27, 28; Phil. 1:6; 1 Cor. 10:13; 1:8, 9), this is precious Gospel comfort, which must not be wickedly abused in the interest of carnal security, since it is meant for the believer only inasmuch as he is a new man and continues in true faith in Christ. We proceed rightly and Scripturally only if we always view our election and salvation in Christ;

for the certainty of our salvation must not be determined from the Law or from feeling or from appearance (as the Formula of Concord so earnestly warns us), but from Christ's serious and universal Gospel-promises, upon which we rest our hope of eternal life. The believer, holding to Christ in true faith, should rejoice in his salvation; but if he turns away from Christ to the Law or to works or to anything else, he must not falsely comfort himself with any supposed absolute election assurance suggested to him by his feeling or inward conviction but must realize that, since he rejects Christ, he rejects also His salvation and is therefore lost, unless, of course, he returns to Christ in true repentance.

That, in the briefest form, is the Scriptural doctrine on this point, and we pastors must consider it again and again and, besides, carefully inculcate it upon our hearers, since today so many Reformed enthusiasts falsely seek to console men with the erroneous notion that, "once a believer, always a believer."

J. T. M.

Der Tag der Kreuzigung Jesu julianisch datiert

Lactanz (gest. um 330) schreibt hierüber in seiner Schrift *De Mortibus Persecutorum* zu Anfang des 2. Kapitels: „In den letzten Zeiten [des 15. Jahres] des Kaisers Liberius ist, wie wir geschrieben lesen, unser Herr Jesus Christus von den Juden gekreuzigt worden am 10. nach den Kalenden des April (am 10. April), als die beiden Gemini Konsuln waren.“ Die Klausel „wie wir geschrieben lesen“ verrät Quellenstudien, die Lactanz wahrscheinlich wegen der Osterstreitigkeiten machte, und sichert seiner Angabe möglichste Korrektheit. Doch dies sein Datum kann nur durch die Sonntagsbuchstabenmethode bestätigt werden, wonach die Buchstaben G bis A zu den Wochentagen gesetzt wurden: beständig G zu Sonntag, F zu Montag, A zu Samstag.

In Paulhs' „Real-Enzyklopädie“, VII, 2573, steht: „Auf dem als *Fasti Sabini* bezeichneten Kalenderfragment aus der Zeit des Augustus (CIL I², 220) werden Reihen von sieben Buchstaben (G—A) zur Bezeichnung der sieben-tägigen Woche gesetzt.“ Mit der Zeit wurden sie Sonntagsbuchstaben genannt. Ihre Bedeutung ist, daß der Buchstabe, der beim 7. Januar¹⁾ steht, die Tage des Jahres so regiert, daß man die Wochentage findet. Es führte das auch zum 28jährigen Sonnengirkel, der mit einem Schaltjahr, wozu zwei Buchstaben gehören, also mit GF 1, beginnt und mit A 28 schließt. „Nach Verlauf solcher 28 Jahre fallen die Wochentage wieder auf dasselbe Datum.“ (Meher, Hand-Lexikon.)

Diese Kalendermethode ist seit den Tagen des Augustus bis heute korrekt befolgt worden. Jrgendeine Unregelmäßigkeit während des Verlaufs eines Jahres ändert jedoch sofort die Reihenfolge der Buchstaben. So war vom 1. Januar bis zum 4. Oktober 1582 G 23 der Sonntagsbuchstabe. Nun fiel auf Verordnung Gregors XIII. hin der 5.—14. Oktober aus, so daß vom 15. Oktober an C 15 der Buchstabe war. Vom 4. Oktober 1582 aufwärts bis zum 25. Juli 325 findet sich keine Unregelmäßigkeit in der Abfolge des Son-

1) „Der 7. des 1. Monats hat von alters her im religiösen und praktischen Leben eine Rolle gespielt.“ (Paulhs, a. a. O., S. 2579.) Der 7. Januar war nach römischer Anschauung in der ersten Woche des neuen Jahres der erste Tag desselben, da sie die Kalenderzeit rückläufig bestimmten: von Kalenden, Nonen, Iden aufwärts.

nenzirkels. Sonntag, den 25. Juli 325, feierte Konstantin die zwanzigste Jahrgang seiner Thronbesteigung.

Eusebius teilt in seiner Schrift *De Martyribus Palaestinae* als Augenzeuge der Diokletianischen Verfolgung etliche Märtyrertage samt den Wochentagsbezeichnungen mit, so Kap. VII: „Am 2. April 307, am Ostersonntag, wurde die noch keine achtzehn Jahre alte Theodosia schrecklich gemartert und schließlich im Meer ertränkt.“ Nach dem 2. April 307 bis zum Sonntag, 25. Juli 325, vergingen dem Kalender nach 6,689 Tage. Wird die Summe durch 7 dividiert, sollte der Quotient eine restlose Zahl sein; aber die Antwort ist 955, R. 4.

Nun ist bekannt, daß im Jahre des Nizäischen Konzils das Datum der Frühjahrs-Tag- und Nachtgleiche (Äquinoktium) aus dem 25. März, der bisher dafür galt, in das richtigere Datum, nämlich den 21. März, verändert wurde. Das konnte jedoch nur durch Eliminierung von vier Tagen aus der Kalenderzeit dieses Jahres geschehen, wie im Kalender des Jahres 1582 von Gregor zehn Tage gestrichen wurden. Auch wurde bekanntlich zu Nizäa der erste Sonntag nach dem ersten Vollmond im Frühjahr als Osterzeit geordnet. Die Auidianer machten diese Änderung nicht mit und beschuldigten etwa vierzig Jahre später die Orthodoxen, sie hätten sich einer Gefälligkeit (prospolepsia) gegen den weltlichen Kaiser schuldig gemacht; „denn“, sagten sie, „als die Feierlichkeit des Konstantin statt hatte, ändert ihr die Osterfeier“. (Epiphanius, *Adv. Haereses*, I, 821. A. Audiani, IX; cf. 826, XIV.) Das weist deutlich darauf hin, daß die vier Tage just vor Konstantins zwanzigster Jahresfeier seiner Thronbesteigung aus dem Kalender gestrichen wurden, also der 21. bis 24. Juli, so daß diese Feier anstatt am Donnerstag am vorhergehenden Sonntag vor sich ging. Das änderte nun auch die Reihenfolge der Sonntagsbuchstaben aus C 26 in F 18 für die Tage vom 1. Januar bis zum 20. Juli; denn da der 20. Juli auf einen Samstag fiel, war für die Zeit von da aufwärts bis zum 1. Januar F 18 Sonntagsbuchstabe.

Wird nun von F 18 für die erste Hälfte des Jahres 325 der Sonnenzirkel bis ins Jahr 30 verfolgt, das Dionysius richtig als das Jahr der Kreuzigung Jesu festlegte, so wird D 3 für dies Jahr 30 als Sonntagsbuchstabe gefunden. Unter D 3 aber fällt der 7. Januar auf Mittwoch und dementsprechend der 10. April auf Freitag. Somit haben die Quellenstudien des Lattanz das richtige damalige julianische Datum für den Tag der Kreuzigung Jesu erforscht.²⁾ W. G.

Table-Prayer of Oxford Students in Christ College Dining-Hall (built under Cardinal Wolsey)

Nos, miseri homines et egeni, pro cibis, quos nobis ad corporis subsidium benigne es largitus, tibi, Deus omnipotens, Pater Coelestis, gratias reverenter agimus, simul obsecrantes ut iis sobrie, modeste atque grate utamur, per Iesum Christum, Dominum nostrum. Amen. M. S. S.

2) Nach der Sonntagsbuchstabenliste ordnet sich denn auch der Märtyrertag des Polycharp, „133 Jahre nach Christi Kreuzigung“; cf. *Chronikon Paschale*, auf Samstag (Sabbatum Magnum), 23. Februar 163, unter dem Buchstaben F 24. Der Märtyrertag des Ignatius hingegen wiederum fiel in das Schaltjahr 108 unter den Buchstaben ED 25 auf Sonntag, 20. Dezember. Diese beiden Daten hat die griechische Kirche als die Gedenktag dieser Märtyrer in ihrem Kalender aufbehalten.

Evolution Opposed

In a very informing article appearing in the *Presbyterian* for March 10, 1938, W. Bell Dawson, M. A., D. Sc., F. R. C. S., presents some arguments which show how untenable even from the point of view of the scientist the theory of evolution, when closely scrutinized, proves to be. Discussing plants and trees, he says, among other things:

"We see also in the world a wonderful variety of vegetation. There are humble kinds of mosses and ferns which have no flowers; there are pine-trees and spruces which do not bear any nuts or fruits; and there are fruit-trees and plants with their seeds inside their fruit, as currants and apples have. So, when we look over all the different plants and vegetables and trees, what comes out most clearly is the contrast between the different kinds. Ferns have spores, almost like dust, instead of seeds. Some trees, such as the palm, have stems that are strengthened inwardly, whereas the birch and the maple add layers of wood to the outside of their trunks as they grow taller. The leaves of the pine and the oak and the way their seeds are formed, could hardly be more different. Everywhere we look we see opposites and no connecting links. How, then, can we suppose that one kind of plant developed from another? The great vegetable world of plants and trees is an immense puzzle to the evolutionists; and in consequence very few botanists who study these things believe in evolution."

In another section, speaking of the world of minute things, consisting of only one cell, he says:

"First of all, is it certain that these are the primary living things and the earliest in the world? In reality there are very large groups of one-celled creatures which can only live with the help of what is more advanced than themselves. Some are helpful to plants and live on their roots (enabling plants to assimilate nitrogen). Then the molds and other scavengers live on decaying matter. Many others live within the bodies of insects or animals; and some kinds get their nourishment from these animals, while others help them to digest their food. Others again cause diseases. It is plain that none of these kinds could have existed before there were well-developed plants and high animals in the world. These minute creatures thus serve definite purposes in nature. It may possibly be that the Creator made them in different ages, as they were needed. Can we say that the divine intelligence in creating a tiny creature or the power of God to make it live, is less than for some larger animal?"

"We next ask: If these one-celled things can change so easily into better creatures, as the evolutionists say, why is it that they have not done so long ago? How does it happen that there are such multitudes and such varieties of them still in the world? Then again, if we are trying to see whether each seed that grows and each animal that is born is a little better than its father or its parent plant, we would have to watch a very long time to see any change. For seeds take a year to grow, and most animals and birds have young ones only once a year. But there are these tiny one-celled things which multiply so fast that it is possible for their numbers to double every half hour. There are as

many generations among them in three weeks as sheep or birds have in a thousand years. So here surely is a splendid chance to see if creatures change, and if anything does, those lowly and simple things should do so.

“Among them all, the disease germs have probably been the most carefully studied. Yet, if there was any change at all, this study would be quite useless, because from one year to another a typhoid germ might turn into a malaria germ. There would thus be no certain way of telling one disease from another. One year for these germs is the same as 175 centuries in producing breeds of cattle. So it is really very wonderful that they show no change whatever. How can the evolutionist explain this?

“It may seem strange to ask whether we can always tell a plant from an animal; but when we come down to creatures which have only one cell for their whole body, it may not be so easy. Yet it is important, for the evolutionist has to prove that plants turned into animals or at least that they were both the same at first, or he must give up his theory of evolution.

“The distinction between plant and animal that is most readily seen is shown by the two different ways in which they nourish themselves. A plant can get all that it needs to live upon from the air and water and the ground. It takes the gases in the air and the salts dissolved in water or in the earth and manufactures these into starch and sugar and even higher products. No animal can do this, for it cannot live directly on the air and water and earth. An animal must have for its food the things which plants have already prepared; and if it eats milk and eggs or even meat, these have already been produced by other animals from the vegetations which they fed upon.

“We may sum it all up by saying that plants make food and animals use it up. This is strictly correct; and the use to which the animal puts this food is just the opposite of what the plant has done. We could make this very plain if we could go into the chemistry of it all; but we will just give one sentence of this: *Plants produce starches and albumins directly from inorganic substances by deoxidizing them and thus obtain their heat and muscular energy.* This shows the gap which there is between vegetable and animal life, which on the whole are just the opposite of each other.”

A.

