

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XXII.

JULY, 1918.

No. 3.

THE SYMBOLISM OF THE LUTHERAN CULTUS.*

Divine worship in the Christian Church is not an *adiaphoron*. The Lord expressly commands that His Word be heard, John 8, 47. He has only severe censure for those who forsake the Christian assemblies, Heb. 10, 25. He expressly enjoins public prayer, 1 Tim. 2, 1. 2. 8. He graciously promises His divine presence at such assemblies, Matt. 18, 20. He records with approval the public services of the early Christians, Acts 2, 42—47.

But though He has prescribed the *general* content of public worship, though He is present in the sacramental acts of divine service, declaring and appropriating to the believers the means of grace, and though He graciously receives the sacrificial acts of the assembled congregation, in confession and prayer and offerings, He has not commanded a definite form or order of divine service. It is a matter of Christian liberty whether a congregation wishes one or many prayers, one or several

* In addition to the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, the following books were consulted: Alt, H., *Christlicher Kultus*. Berlin, 1851. Cooper, F. E.; Keever, E. F.; Seegers, J. C.; Stump, J., *An Explanation of the Common Service*. Philadelphia, 1912. Daniel, H., *Codex liturgicus ecclesiae universae*. Lipsiae, 1847—1853. Fuerbringer, L., *Leitfaden fuer Vorlesungen, Liturgik*. St. Louis, 1915. Gueranger, L. P., *The Liturgical Year*. Vol. I. Worcester-London, 1895. Horn, E. T., *Outlines of Liturgics*. Second Edition. Philadelphia, 1912. Kliefoth, Th., *Liturgische Abhandlungen I*. Schwerin und Rostock, 1854. Kliefoth, Th., *Die urspruengliche Gottesdienstordnung*. Bd. 5. Schwerin, 1861. Lochner, F., *Der Hauptgottesdienst der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*. St. Louis, 1895. Synodalbericht, Nebraska, 1898, 1903. THEOL. QUART., I, VII.

MATERIALS FOR THE CATECHIST.

SEVENTH OUTLINE.

THE SECOND TABLE. Qu. 36. 37.

Luther has called the First Table the right, the Second the left. (10, 151.) The idea is, that we are surrounded on all sides with manifestations of the divine will. It is the same God who addresses us in the last seven as in the first three commandments, and we serve Him still when we comply with the Law of the Second Table. The injunctions and prohibitions laid down in the Second Table create duties just as solemn as those in the First. The Second Table is not inferior to the First, as regards dignity of origin, nobility of aim, and practical usefulness. It differs from the First only in this respect, that it has to do with beings inferior to God. "The First Table is above the Second, and God is superior to the creatures. Accordingly, when a situation arises where a person has to renounce either God or a creature, he must renounce the creature rather than God. Inasmuch as the commandments in the Second Table relate to the creatures, we must let the creatures slip, and this Table must yield when it conflicts with the First. This should be borne in mind over and against our present devils, who are shouting: We must listen to the Church and to the government, over and above the Holy Scriptures and the Word of God, and in opposition to it. This is horrible madness, to place the Second Table ahead of the First, man or a creature ahead of the Creator, and to teach: The Church must be obeyed even when it commands something that is plainly against the Word of God. But this matter is settled by the passage, Acts 5, 29: 'We must obey God rather than men,' just as Christ says in this place [Matt. 10, 36]: 'I shall set the son at variance against his father,' that is, In the matter of obeying commandments I want to be preferred even to parents and all kings." (7, 108.) In loving and serving men, however, under the Law of the Second Table, we are still loving and serving God; we love and serve our neighbor along with God. "God grant that we take this to heart, and so regard our neighbor that any service rendered to him is regarded as if rendered to God. If this were done, the whole world would be filled with the worship of God. Servants in the stable, maids in the kitchen, boys at school, would all be servants and worshipers of God, if they would diligently do what father and mother, master and mistress, command them. Every home would be a real church, in which nothing but

divine service is conducted. (13 a, 906.) This teaching will lead to a very severe judgment on the last day. . . . The wicked, says Christ, will ask, 'When have we seen Thee hungry and thirsty?' and He will answer them; 'What ye have done to the least of these, ye have done unto Me.' . . . In many passages He has told the Jews that he does not need their gold, their temple, nor anything else, but if they would serve Him aright, He directed them to their neighbor." (*Ibid.*, p. 903—5.)

Luther has called attention to the fact that the subject-matters of the Second Table coincide with the contents of the ethics of natural religion. "The Second Table embraces the common life of men as viewed by reason. The philosophers who have written on the duties of man have very well explained this life, *viz.*, the Platonists, the Peripatetics, and the Stoics have all said that virtue is the highest good. Though they differ somewhat in their terms, they agree in the matter. They have been able to speak eloquently of this life of which the Second Table treats, because they retain only the definitions of the virtues." (22, 412.) The voice of paganism on the moral duties of man and on the virtuous life, when it speaks truth, is the voice of the unwritten law in the heart of man, and a corroborating witness to the Second Table of the Law. The ethics of natural religion, however, owing to the ravages of inborn sin, do not touch the deep matters contained in the Second Table. Also the *illuminatio legis* in heathen minds is a dim and insufficient affair, and requires reinforcement by means of the written Law. It is well, however, for the Christian teacher to remember that in explaining the duties of man under the Second Table he will find pagans saying many things that he is saying,¹⁾ and saying them oftentimes in a most beautiful and striking manner. Speaking of Seneca, Farrar says: "So nearly, in fact, does he seem to have arrived at the truths of Christianity that to many it seemed a matter for marvel that he could have known them without having heard them from inspired lips. He is constantly cited with approbation by some of the most eminent Christian fathers. Tertullian, Lactantius, even St. Augustine himself, quote his words with marked admiration, and St. Jerome appeals to him as '*our Seneca*.' The Council of Trent go further still, and quote him as though he were an acknowledged father of the Church."²⁾ This is, of course, an extravagant view. It is significant of the trend of thought in the leaders of the Reformed Church, Zwingli and Calvin, that they

1) Thales has said: *Agapa ton plesion*, Love your neighbor. (Stobaeus, *Florilegium* III, 59 e.)

2) *Seekers after God*, p. 6 f.

began their literary career with a reproduction of Seneca's *De Clementia*. One need but examine "Seneca's Resemblances to Scripture"³⁾ to become convinced that in spite of many coincidences there is a vast difference between Scriptural and natural ethics.

I. The Biblical Meaning of the Term "Neighbor." Qu. 37.

A. Luther recognizes our need of instruction as to who is our neighbor.

"It is verily so that no man knows, except by the Spirit of Christ, either what God is, that is, how we must worship and show our gratitude to Him, nor what our neighbor is. For just as all men make themselves a god of their own, and never hit the right one, but become divided in innumerable forms of idolatry, so they are blind in this matter also: they never recognize their neighbor, although he is before their eyes. They may give alms otherwise and do many great works, but they allow him to pass unnoticed, and to suffer misery and hunger, when they ought to serve and help him." (11, 1564.)

B. In His summary of the Second Table, Matt. 22, 39, the Lord calls the object of that love which the entire Law inculcates simply by the general term "neighbor."

1. *Plesion* in the New, and *rea* in the Old Testament (Lev. 19, 18) have, first, a local meaning = he who is nearest to us, *proximus*, *vicinus*.⁴⁾

2. In Matt. 5, 43 *plesion* is the opposite of *echthron*, and evidently stands for "friend."

3. The meaning of the term is broadened, *e. g.*, in Acts 7, 27, where it plainly takes the meaning of the German *Mitmensch*, *Nebemensch*.⁵⁾

4. The idea of nearness is underlying all these meanings. Whether we regard a person as related to us by our common humanity, or by

3) *Ibid.*, chap. XV, p. 160 ff.

4) Our English term is derived from *neah* = nigh + *gebur* = inhabitant.

5) According to Cremer the signification of the term in classical antiquity is *quivis alius*, and the term is applied even to the defendant in a trial at court by the prosecutor. Cremer thinks that the meaning of the term has been deepened and rendered more intense by the Jewish notion that "neighbor" means compatriot and coreligionist. (*Woerterb.*, p. 883.) If this is a deepening, it has been repudiated by the parable of the Good Samaritan, which plainly extends the meaning of the term so as to embrace people of a different religion and faith.

ties of consanguinity and affinity, or by national, racial, and religious ties, he is in either one, or several, or all of those relationships our neighbor. "The Samaritan (in Luke 10, 25 ff.) thinks: Although I am not a Jew as he, still I am a man as he; we have one Creator. Therefore he is nearer to me than an irrational brute. I will not suffer him to lie there. Up with you, my brother, let me help you," etc. (13 a, 849 f. Comp. 13 b, 2327.)

C. The practical definition of the term "neighbor" which our Catechism offers has been gleaned from the parable of the Good Samaritan: Our neighbor is any person whom we find in distress. The starting-point for this definition lies in the work which the Second Table requires of us. Understanding that, we can easily determine the person in whose behalf we are to perform the work. It is like defining bread by saying: It is that which appeases hunger.

1. Does the parable of the Good Samaritan really support this definition? For the Lord applies the term "neighbor" not to him who received, but to him who rendered help. Luther answers this question: "It sounds strange to call him 'neighbor' who shows kindness and love to another. As a rule, we call him 'neighbor' who is in need of kindness, whom we must serve, and to whom we must show our love. And this way of speaking is also in accordance with Scripture, and comports with the tenor of this commandment. But both (he that does, and he that receives, charity) belong together, and Christ comprises both *in praedicamento relationis*. He wraps us all together, implying that one is the other's neighbor." (11, 1565.)⁶⁾

6) Very happily Cremer explains the peculiar application of *plcsion* in Luke 10, 29 ff. thus: "When he with whom I just happen to deal is designated as my neighbor, or, rather, I am asked to regard myself as *his* neighbor in respect of my duty, I am asked to preserve and cherish the bond of fellowship, which moves him so closely to me *that I cannot separate myself from him*. . . . 'By the Christian view of universal love some civil expressions receive an additional religious meaning, which they could not have outside of Christianity. . . . *Thie nahiston* (superlative of *nah*) are in Old High German a person's neighbors in the community. . . . In this sense the term belongs to the Old High German language, and contains no reference to Christianity. However, when the Old High German expression *der nahisto* (= our *der Nachste*) means as much as man, fellow-man, in general, this could occur only as an effect of a faith which declares all men brethren and neighbors. . . . For it was through the conception of Christianity, as Christ expressed it in the parable of the Good

2. The idea that a person's need constitutes him our neighbor appears also in Gal. 6, 10; for *pros pantas*, "unto all men," which indeed extends the scope of the term "neighbor" to the bounds of humanity, nevertheless is qualified by *ergazometha to agathon*: all men are our neighbors in so far as we may do them good because they need it. Thus the very attempt to obtain a Scriptural definition of the term "neighbor" leads to the conviction that what the Second Table inculcates is not the airy notion of universal fellowship, comradeship, altruism, human brotherhood, but hard, practical service. The definition is realized, if not found, in that service.

D. In settling the question, Who is our neighbor? Scripture, on the one hand, permits a distinction to be made, yea, it commands it; on the other hand, Scripture declares certain distinctions which men make inadmissible.

1. In Gal. 6, 10 those "who are of the household of faith" are singled out from "all men" as worthy of the charities which Christians extend to their neighbors. *Oikeioi* is our English "home-folks," and the accompanying genitive of quality, *tes pisteos*, indicates the origin of the relationship. "Paul might also simply have written *pros tous pisteuontas*; but the expression *oikeious t. p.* suggests a stronger motive. Among the *pasi*, in relation to whom we have to put into operation the morally good, those who belong to the faith have the chief claims—because these claims are based on the special sacred duty of fellowship which it involves—in preference to those who are strangers to the faith, although in respect even to the latter that conduct is to be observed which is required in Col. 4, 5; 1 Thess. 4, 12." (Meyer.) "Every man does good to his relatives; believers do good to their relations in the faith, especially to those who are entirely devoted to its propagation, v. 6. So the apostle commends faith itself

Samaritan, that the Old Testament expression received its world-embracing meaning.' R. v. Raumer, *Die Einwirkung des Christentums auf die alt-hochdeutsche Sprache*, p. 401. . . . This view of Raumer, however, needs to be supplemented. While Israel and its theologians never passed beyond the question regarding the scope, and, consequently, regarding the limits of the neighborly relationship, Christ teaches us to cast the question into a different form: Am I not in this instance the nearest person whose service is demanded? Luke 10, 36. Thus the scope of the concept 'neighbor' is not gained by limiting the object, but by a limitation which rests on the demand which in each instance is laid upon the subject. He is neighbor to me who has to depend on me, and for that reason I am his neighbor." (Woerterb., p. 883 f.)

in this passage." (*Bengel*.) The Christian religion does not abrogate the natural relationships into which men enter in this life, but ennobles them. "We are to do good unto everybody, to Gentiles and Jews, to grateful and ungrateful persons, to friends and enemies, to people closely related to us and strangers, in short, love, as we stated, is to be extended without regard of a person. Behold the great extent of Christian benevolence; for it must be full-orbed, as Christ says Matt. 5, 46: 'If ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same?' But he gives the preference to our associates in faith, because we are attached to them by a closer bond, since they are from the same house and congregation, from the same family of Christ, having one faith, one Baptism, one hope, one Lord, and sharing all things with each other." (8, 1649.) Paul, then, does not advocate partiality in what he says, but points out how the general law is regulated by natural causes in particular instances.

2. Any distinction, however, which our selfish heart may make in determining who is our neighbor is rejected by Matt. 5, 44. 45.

a. In general, it makes no difference whether a person is morally *poneros* or *agathos*, whether he is civilly *dikaïos* or *adikos*. Sinners and saints, upright men and crooks, are wards of neighborly love to us, even as they are wards of the Creator's preserving care. We are naturally drawn and prompted to extend help to persons in whom we recognize some merit, but this is not always, perhaps in the fewest instances, possible. The highest merit often goes unrecognized. It is, therefore, a most merciful rule that is here laid down, that makes even those whom we regard as evil and unjust fellow-beings who sit with us at the table which our heavenly Father spreads for all.

b. In particular, it makes no difference whether a person's relation to us is friendly. Personal enmity in all its manifestations makes it very hard for us to regard a person as our neighbor: he seems to decline all notions of relationship to us, and we are nevertheless to assert that relationship. But the law of love correctly embraces our enemies; for their enmity can never destroy a relation that God has established; their whole action against us is a continuous falsehood, an impossible repudiation of us, while what we do to them is truth, the assertion of an indestructible principle.⁷⁾ — By the parable of the Good Samaritan the Lord enforced His teaching in the Sermon on the Mount. He "reproves and rejects the hypocritical gloss of the

7) Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and most modern critics drop the words, "bless them . . . hate you." Meyer and others retain them. They occur uncontested in Luke 6, 27. 28.

Jews, who depict and locate their neighbor according to their conceit. They regard as their neighbor whom they like, that is, their friends, who well deserve their kindness, are worthy of their love, and from whom they have derived, and still hope to derive, benefits. They think that they are under no obligation to serve or help a stranger, persons unknown to them, unworthy, ungrateful persons, and enemies." "The Samaritan was neighbor to the wounded man, not the priest nor the Levite, though they should have been, being under the same obligation. For in this matter all men are under a mutual obligation, because they are all subject to the same God and have the same commandment: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor,' etc. Hence there is no difference as regards this duty, and the meaning of this incident is: Christ forces this hypocrite to acknowledge, in agreement with the common sense of all men, that people who, before God, belong together, one needing help and the other able to render help, are neighbors, and no one is excused or exempt from this duty, no matter whether he is a priest or a Levite." (11, 1564 f.)

II. *Loving Our Neighbor.* Qu. 36.

A. All the duties which the Second Table imposes are, like those of the First Table, summed up in the term *agapan*, which denotes a love on moral grounds, coupled with high esteem and conscientious regard, and is distinct from *philein*, which expresses natural physical desire for a person. (See Third Outline, THEOL. QUART. XIX [1915], p. 21 f.)

1. The term *agapan* is expanded in Matt. 5, 44 by *eulogein* ("bless"), *kalos poiein* ("do good"), *proseuchesthai* ("pray for"). "Observe the entire love which is here required: *disposition, word, act, intercession.*" (Meyer.) Of these four notions, Bengel, from whom Meyer borrowed them, says: "The third is almost entirely contained in the first, and the second in the fourth." They are, in fact, all contained in the first. The love which we owe our neighbor must be cordial and active, calling forth ever new and ever greater efforts from us, and coping even with the greatest difficulties. *Agapan* never signifies mere feeling, a Platonic affection, an idealistic view of universal brotherhood. It is an energetic exertion of the powers of the intellect and will in the service of another. Rightly Wilke-Grimm paraphrase *plesion einai* thus: *officia amici et socii alieni praestare*, and cite Luke 10, 29 as proof. (p. 361.) "To act as a neighbor to

another is of two kinds: 1. only in name and with words; 2. by acts and in deed." (11, 1565.)

2. In Gal. 6, 10 the phrase *ergazesthai to agathon* ("do good") must, therefore, be treated as practically a synonym of *agapan*. Speaking of weak interpretations of this phrase, Meyer says: "The *morally good*, not the *useful*. Not merely the article, but also the use of the expression by Paul, in definite connection with *ergazesthai*, as applying to morality active in works (Rom. 2, 10; Eph. 4, 28), ought to have prevented the interpretation of *to agathon*, at variance with the context, as *benefits*. Hofmann's interpretation ('do good towards others'), in more general terms evading the definite idea, amounts to the same thing. The *agathon* in this passage is the same as *to kalon* in v. 9. That which is *good* is also that which is *morally beautiful*. Comp. especially Rom. 7, 18 f." *Kalos poiein* in Matt. 5, 44 has virtually the same meaning: it merely brings out more directly the quality of the *actor*, instead of that of the *act*.

3. Neighborly love must be constant. Not only must it be exercised under the varying and continuing conditions indicated in Matt. 5, 44, not only must it accompany its objects as long as there is need of serving them, as the action of the Good Samaritan shows, not only must it be ever recurring, prompt, and regular as the rising of God's sun and the falling of God's rain, Matt. 5, 45, but our whole life must be consecrated to it. "The specialty," says Meyer of Paul's exhortation in Gal. 6, 10, "lies in *hos kairon echomen*, which is therefore emphatically prefixed: *as we have a season suitable thereto*. This seasonable time will have elapsed when the *parousia* sets in; we must therefore utilize it as ours by the *ergazesthai to agathon*. The same idea as the *exagorazesthai to kairon* in Eph. 5, 16; Col. 4, 5." "It is as if he wished to say: Do good now while you may; for you will be surprised to note how the time is slipping away from you. Do not let such thoughts as these fool you: Ah, well, in a year, or in two or three years, I shall get to this business." (12, 929.) The text is weakened by an interpretation like this: whenever an opportunity is offered us.

B. Neighborly love has its standard of perfection fixed by the phrase *hos seauton* in Matt. 22, 39.

1. It is not to be raised to such a height as the love of God, which is to exceed our love of anything and everything else. Like ourselves, our neighbor is a creature, and cannot be honored like the Creator.

2. But, on the other hand, being a creature like ourselves, our love of the neighbor must not be inferior to the love we have for our-

selves. "Love must do away with the distinction between I and Thou." (*Meyer.*)⁸

8) The popular idea that self-love is commanded by God finds expression in sayings like "Charity begins at home," "Everybody for himself, and God for us all," and in those vulgar phrases, "Look out for Number One," "Paddle your own canoe." It is a hoary error. "From the words of this commandment some fathers have evolved the notion that ordinate love begins with the love of self. For self-love, they say, is prescribed as a rule for your love of the neighbor. I shall merely express my opinion on this matter; it is this: My understanding of this commandment is, that it does not command love of self, but only love of our neighbor. Because, in the first place, self-love is already too firmly rooted and dominant in all men. Again, if God had intended to ordain self-love, He would have said: Love thyself, and, after that, thy neighbor as thyself. However, He says: 'Love thy neighbor as thyself,' that is, love him in the same manner as you are already loving yourself without any command to that effect. In this manner, too, the apostle in 1 Cor. 13, 5 predicates of love as a peculiar quality, that it seeketh not its own, thus utterly repudiating by these words love of self. In like manner Christ commanded men to deny themselves, and to hate their own lives, Mark 8, 35. In Phil. 2, 4 it is clearly stated that no one is to seek what is his, but what conduces to the welfare of others. Lastly, if man possessed a proper love of self, he would not now need the grace of God. For this very love, if it is of the proper kind, causes a person to love himself and his neighbor. Nor does the Law inculcate any love other than this. But, as I said, the Law presupposes that man already loves himself, and when Christ says, Matt. 7, 12: 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you,' etc., He clearly shows that they already have inhering in them a concern and love for themselves, and He issues no command whatever regarding this matter, as you see yourself. Therefore, as I take it, it seems to me that the Law speaks of *perverse* love, which causes everybody to forget his neighbor, and to strive only after such things as are useful and advantageous to himself. This love becomes an ordered love when a person forgets himself and serves only his neighbor. We have an illustration of this in the members of our body, each of which, even at some risk to itself, serves the other. For the hand fights for the head, and receives injuries; the feet step into mud and dirt and water, in order to rescue the entire body. Moreover, by this interpretation of the commandment the affection for oneself and the inclination to seek one's personal advantage is dangerously nourished, while Christ meant to crush it utterly by this commandment. However, if I should ever have to admit that the love of self is here commanded, I should take a still higher ground, and say that such love is always false and wrong as long as it is self-centered, and that it cannot be good unless it goes without, entering into God, that is, my own will and my love of self must be entirely dead, and I must not seek to have

3. The most effectual and practical method for determining in a given instance what the law of love for a fellow-man requires is stated in Matt. 7, 12.9) "I would like to be loved in such a manner that, whenever I have done evil, I may be forgiven; but I fail to do the same to others. I notice that they are vicious in their dealings with me, and yet I must act as if I do not notice it, and continue loving them. That is what loving our neighbor means, and that is what the Lord accounts as of equal importance with the First Commandment." (7, 2458.) "A person should strive to be much more willing to share his goods with others than to desire theirs; for that is included in love, which is the fulfilling of the Law, viz., not only to abstain utterly from the neighbor's possessions, but to act as neighbor to others by sharing his own goods with them in every possible way. For, no doubt, everybody wishes to be treated thus himself, viz., that others share their goods with him, and nobody seeks to take away from him what he has, but is glad that he has it. As regards this commandment, which covers such intricate transactions, no

anything except the pure will of God accomplished in me, so that I am ready to die, to live, to any form of existence which my Potter, God, wants to give me. Human nature finds this hard, wearisome, and impossible. For then I love myself, not in myself, but in God, not in my will, but in God's will. And I would then likewise love my neighbor as myself; I would only wish and labor to have the will of God, not my own will, done. But I do not think that they have understood this commandment; nor is this commandment understood as speaking of love. Therefore I warn everybody to beware of these heathenish maxims and sayings: *Proximus esto tibi, Du sollst dir Naechste sein*; and: *Bin jeder fuer sich selbst, Gott fuer alle*, and the like, for they are false and perverted, as the commandment itself shows." (8, 1595.) "When Christ in Matt. 22, 39 tells us to love our neighbor as ourselves, He is, according to my opinion, speaking of that perverted and wrong self-love by which a person only seeks his own interest. This love cannot be corrected except by ceasing to seek one's personal interest and by consulting the neighbor's interest. That is the meaning of St. Paul when in Phil. 2, 4 he says: 'Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others,' and in 1 Cor. 13, 5: 'Love seeketh not her own.' In these words he plainly forbids self-love. Therefore the meaning of this commandment: 'Love thy neighbor as thyself,' seems to be this: You are loving yourself alone, and that is wrong; but if you would direct such love as you have towards your neighbor, you would love him aright. This becomes evident from the fact that He does not command a person to love himself, which He certainly would have done if self-love were good. But He finds self-love already existing, transfers it to another object, and thus makes it right." (18, 357.)

9) "The golden rule." *Stand. Dict., s. v. "golden."*

better rule can be given than that in all his dealings with his neighbor every person should place before his eyes this word of Christ, which furnishes the spiritual interpretation of all the commandments: 'All things whatsoever,' etc. Matt. 7, 12, and the saying of Tobit, chap. 4, 16." (3, 1321.) "Everybody is thus disposed: when he is ill, he would like to see all men come to aid him. When I am a poor sinner, have fallen into disgrace, and have a burdened conscience, I would like to see all men come to comfort me, and to help me cover up my sin and shame. Accordingly, I must treat my neighbor the same way; I must not judge nor condemn him, but forgive him his trespasses, help him, advise him, lend and give to him, just as I would wish that others should do to me when I am in anguish and sorrow, misery and poverty." (11, 1285.)

4. To come back once more to the parable of the Good Samaritan which should be drawn upon throughout this catechization, Luther says: "Christ is a thorny and annoying speaker, because He assails the priests and Levites, that is, most holy people and peculiar servants of God, and raises, oh! what a charge against them by holding up to them for their shame and ridicule the Samaritan, whom they abhorred and loathed as a reprobate. Thus He shows that it is the way of the world that those who are the most prominent, and boast that they are keeping God's commandments, are teaching them to others, and ought to set a good example, in brief, those who are regarded as high, prudent, mighty, and the best people, have least love for their neighbor, especially for the poor, forsaken Christians, who are persecuted for the sake of God and His Word. For they regard only their own holiness, prudence, and great gifts; *they imagine that everybody owes them service; they do not consider that what they have has been given them by God for no other purpose than that they should place their holiness, wisdom, honor, and possessions at the service of the needy, unwise, sinners, and castaways.* Therefore, it is proper that this Samaritan is praised, to the everlasting disgrace of the priests and Jewish saints (also of this hypocrite in our Gospel-lesson), because he showed love and kindness to this wounded stranger (who, no doubt, was also a Jew), while his own priest, Levite, and doctor of the Scriptures suffered him to lie there in such misery and agony that, as far as they cared, he would have to die and perish." (11, 1566.) Query: How would the priest and Levite have wished to be treated if they had been in the wounded man's place?

C. The study of the Second Table will quicken in us the sense of our sinfulness and the need of the Savior. "Show me

a person who in his heart and soul is chaste or in any other way godly: there is none on earth. We find that we are inclined to anger, hatred, worldly lust, rather than to meekness and other virtues. Now, if I do not find a spark of such an inclination in me, everything is wrong; satisfaction has not been made to the Law. However, I find in me not only a spark, but a whole furnace full of the fire of evil inclination. For there is no love in my heart, yea, not in any of my members. Accordingly, I behold in the Law, as in a mirror, that all that is in me is under the curse and condemnation of God. For not a tittle of the Law can perish; all must be fulfilled, as Christ says Matt. 5, 18: 'I say unto you,' etc. Now, you do not find that you are doing with your heart and soul, with joy and rejoicing, what the Law demands of you. Hence you are damned and belong to the devil. Apply this to yourself. See that you first attain to this knowledge that you confess: I belong to the devil. . . . Our sophists did not consider this, but taught us that, if a person did what he could, God would aid him with His grace. They are blind leaders; they admit that man is quite unwilling to do anything good; still if he sets out to do it, though in a labored, grudging, and lazy manner, he is well off with God. Christ, however, teaches the contrary: we are to do all with our heart and soul, and are to be very ready to do it." "Whoever would like to understand properly and thoroughly why the Law does not save us, let him consider these two points of which the lawyer speaks, and let him diligently ponder what it means to love God with all the heart, etc., and our neighbor as ourselves. He will find what a difficult and impossible thing it is, unless the Holy Spirit is given us into our hearts by the Lord Jesus and His Gospel. It is easily said: I love God; for He does not come to us in person and does not require that we are at great expense and make great preparations for entertaining Him. Let us consider, however, how we are treating poor people, and we shall soon discover whether we love God." (13 a, 852; comp. 13 b, 2329.) D.
